





PRESENTED BY

*Mr. J. A. Hopkins*

G.M. Elliott Library  
Cincinnati Bible College & Seminary  
2700 Glenway Avenue  
P.O. Box 04320  
Cincinnati, Ohio 45204-3200

J. A. Shoptime  
- 1920  

---

" "



Digitized by the Internet Archive  
in 2023 with funding from  
Kahle/Austin Foundation

<https://archive.org/details/jesusprincipleso0000char>

THE BIBLE'S MESSAGE TO MODERN LIFE

# Jesus' Principles of Living

BY

CHARLES FOSTER KENT, PH.D., LITT.D.

*Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University*

AND

JEREMIAH WHIPPLE JENKS, PH.D., LL.D.

*Research Professor of Government and Public Administration  
in New York University*

G.M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY,  
Cincinnati Bible College & Seminary

NEW YORK  
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS  
1920

232.95

K413j

COPYRIGHT, 1920  
BY CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS



# CONTENTS

	<b>PAGE</b>
<b>INTRODUCTION.....</b>	<i>v</i>
<b>CHAPTER I. JESUS' INTERPRETATION OF HIS TASK.....</b>	<b>1</b>
1. The Religious Needs of the Men of Jesus' Day. 2. Their Physical and Moral Needs. 3. The Way in Which John the Baptist Tried to Meet These Needs. 4. Jesus' Appreciation of These Vital Needs. 5. Jesus' Consciousness of a Call to Serve. 6. The Temptations Which Confronted Jesus.	
<b>CHAPTER II. JESUS' METHODS OF WORK.....</b>	<b>10</b>
1. Jesus' Adaption of His Methods to Different Situations and Individuals. 2. His Appeal to Human Interest. 3. His Acts of Healing. 4. Personal Friendship and Discipleship. 5. Preaching and Teaching. 6. Personal Example and Social Method.	
<b>CHAPTER III. GOD AND MAN.....</b>	<b>22</b>
1. The Fatherhood of God. 2. Co-operation Between God and Man. 3. Sin. 4. The Essentials of Worship. 5. Faith and Prayer. 6. The Eternal Life.	
<b>CHAPTER IV. TRUTHFULNESS AND SINCERITY.....</b>	<b>37</b>
1. Jesus' Frank Recognition of His Own Limitations and Superiority. 2. The Fundamental Significance of Motives. 3. Simplicity and Directness. 4. Integrity in Business. 5. Honesty in Politics. 6. Sincerity in the Religious Life.	
<b>CHAPTER V. PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY.....</b>	<b>47</b>
1. The Infinite Worth of the Individual. 2. The Responsibility of the Individual. 3. Independence of Judgment. 4. Tolerance. 5. The Necessity of Preparation for Responsibility. 6. Practical Application of the Golden Rule.	
<b>CHAPTER VI. THE VALUE AND USE OF WEALTH.....</b>	<b>60</b>
1. The Standard by Which Jesus Measured Wealth. 2. The Perils of Wealth. 3. The Acquisition of Wealth. 4. The Trusteeship of Wealth. 5. Practical Christian Charity. 6. Control of Wealth by the State.	
<b>CHAPTER VII. RECREATION AND THE CHRISTIAN USE OF THE SABBATH.....</b>	<b>74</b>
1. Jesus' Appreciation of Recreation. 2. The Psychological Basis of Recreation. 3. The Attitude of the Church toward Play and Recreation. 4. The Regulation and Direction of Popular Amusements. 5. Jesus' Interpretation of the Sabbath. 6. The Effective Christian Use of the Sabbath.	
<b>CHAPTER VIII. THE FAMILY AND BELOVED COMMUNITY.....</b>	<b>87</b>
1. Jesus' Recognition of the Importance of the Family. 2. The Duties of Husbands and Wives. 3. The Obligations of Parents and Children. 4. Masters and Servants. 5. The Rehabilitation of the Home. 6. The Beloved Community.	

CHAPTER IX. THE CITIZEN AND THE STATE.....	102
1. Jesus' Conception of the Citizen's Duties. 2. The Authority and Obligations of Rulers. 3. Ethical Standards of Government. 4. The Doctrine of Non-Resentment. 5. The Obligations of State to State. 6. The Christian Program for World Peace.	
CHAPTER X. THE RULE OF GOD.....	114
1. Current Jewish Ideas of the Rule of God. 2. Jesus' Interpretation of the Rule of God. 3. The Growth of the Rule of God. 4. Conditions of Participation in the Rule of God. 5. The Individual's Part in this Rule. 6. The Rule of God and the State.	
CHAPTER XI. THE WAY TO HAPPINESS AND SUCCESS.....	125
1. Jesus' Appreciation of Happiness. 2. The Mental Attitudes Essential to Happiness. 3. The Attitude toward Society Essential for Happiness. 4. The Joy of Co-operating with God. 5. Community Happiness and Success. 6. National Happiness and Success.	
CHAPTER XII. THE UNIVERSALITY OF JESUS' PRINCIPLES OF LIFE	137
1. Jesus, the Real Discoverer of the Individual. 2. The World's Greatest Social Psychologist. 3. The Supreme Interpreter of God. 4. The Com- plete Harmonizer of Man with God. 5. The Founder of Complete Democracy. 6. The Eternal Cosmopolitan.	

## INTRODUCTION.

The world to-day is passing through a great economic, social, and religious revolution of which the Great War was but the prelude. Men are changing their views on many vital questions with a rapidity that often appalls. Many established institutions are being revised or discarded. The immovable conservatism and the calm assurance of the pre-war period are gone. Men and nations are well aware that they are faring forth on uncharted seas. These facts explain why they are turning to the teachings of Jesus with new interest and eagerness. Statesmen, leaders in industry, and scientists are proclaiming their deep conviction that his principles of living alone can guide the individual and society through the social, political, and industrial storms that are raging on every side and teach them how to give to community and state a stable yet progressive development, in the promotion of which each man can find real happiness and worthy self-expression.

Jesus worked and taught with these ends ever in view. He aimed to do a practical work. The political and social conditions of the Roman world during the first Christian century were strikingly like those of to-day. Humanity felt its unity and at the same time was dissatisfied with its inherited ideas and institutions. A yearning for social justice, for brotherhood, and for spiritual satisfaction filled the hearts of men. In satisfying the longings of his own day by laying down principles of living that are universal, Jesus met in a unique way the similar needs of the present age. His teachings are so many-sided that no one interpreter can do them full justice.

The aim in this volume has been to interpret the teachings of Jesus frankly, simply, and constructively in the light of modern conditions, and to make clear the trail that Jesus blazed by which each man may find the larger life in union and co-operation with the eternal Source of all life. Above all, the endeavor throughout has been to formulate the vital questions that now confront the citizens of every country and to help them in the light of Jesus' principles of living to think them through and to reach a true and practical solution.

This volume is intended for the general reader as well as for college and adult classes. It may be used for a rapid twelve-week survey of Jesus' practical philosophy of life, but can best be studied more leisurely, with pauses for detailed investigation and discussion at the points where the interests of the class focus. It is also suggested that, as a background for the study, the members of the class read the continuous older record of Jesus' life and work as it is presented in the modern translation found in pages 1-61 of the *Shorter Bible* — The New Testament, from which the Biblical passages in the present volume are quoted.

#### BOOKS OF REFERENCE.

The books of reference here suggested have been carefully selected in order that each student may have for his individual use a practical working library. The writers do not indorse all the views expressed in the books, but they will be found suggestive and helpful. The following should be at hand for constant reference:

Kent, C. F., *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*. Contains the leading social teachings of the prophets and sages and of Jesus and Paul arranged in chronological order and interpreted in the light both of their original setting and of modern social conditions. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Cooley, C. H., *Social Organization*. An excellent work giving the fundamental principles of social organization, which will form a valuable basis for judging the scientific worth of Jesus' teachings. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Follett, M. P., *The New State*. A suggestive work which breaks away from the old forms of political organization and makes suggestions for practical work that will serve as a valuable means of stimulating thought. Very helpful, but not always to be accepted without question as the final judgment on the topics discussed. Longmans, Green & Company, New York.

For further parallel study the following books are suggested:

Glover, T. R., *The Jesus of History*. A fresh, vivid study of the personality and work of the Founder of Christianity. Association Press, New York.

Kent, C. F., *The Life and Teachings of Jesus* (Vol. V of *The Historical Bible*.) Like the other volumes of this series it contains a modern translation of the oldest records, arranged

in chronological order, with the historical, geographical and archæological notes required for their clear understanding. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York.

Jenks, J. W., *Governmental Action for Social Welfare*. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Ross, G. A. J., *The Universality of Jesus*. A broad and stimulating presentation of the significance of the work and teachings of Jesus in their larger world relations. F. H. Revell Co., New York.

Fosdick, H. E., *The Meaning of Prayer*. A thoughtful, constructive, and inspiring discussion of the various aspects of this vital subject. Association Press, New York.

Edwards, R. H., *Popular Amusements*. A careful study of the different forms of popular amusement in order to determine the best ways in which to develop the values and eliminate the evils inherent in each. Association Press, New York.

Hartshorne, H., *Childhood and Character*. An original and constructive presentation of the characteristics of boys and girls and of the practical ways in which parents and teachers may co-operate in their development. Pilgrim Press, Boston.

Hilty, Karl, *Happiness*. A sane and satisfactory discussion of this theme by this eminent Swiss jurist. The Macmillan Company, New York.

Jenks, J. W., *Principles of Politics*. A discussion which dwells upon the motives of political action and the impelling forces that guide the various departments of government. The Columbia University Press, New York.



# CHAPTER I.

## JESUS' INTERPRETATION OF HIS TASK.

### *Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *Historical Bible*, Vol. V, *The Life and Teachings of Jesus*, pp. 62-69.

Glover, *The Jesus of History*, pp. 63-72.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 3-50.

Follett, *The New State*, pp. 3-15.

At this time Jesus exclaimed, "I praise thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that though thou hast hidden these things from the wise and learned, thou hast revealed them to those who are untaught; yes, Father, for such has been thy gracious purpose. Everything has been revealed to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son but the Father, nor does any one know the Father except the Son and him to whom the Son will reveal him." — *Matt. 11: 25-27.*

At sight of the crowds, harassed and scattered like sheep without a shepherd, he was filled with pity. . . . — *Matt. 9: 36.*

And after he had fasted forty days and forty nights he was hungry. Then the tempter came and said to him, "If you are the Son of God, command these stones to become bread." But he answered, "It is written,

'Man is not to live on bread alone,

But on every word that comes from God.' "

Then the devil took him to the holy city and, setting him on the pinnacle of the Temple, said to him, "If you are the Son of God, throw yourself down; for it is written,

'He will give his angels charge of you,

And on their hands they will bear you up,

Lest you strike your foot against a stone.' "

Jesus said to him, "It is also written,

'You shall not tempt the Lord your God.' "

Once more the devil took him to a high mountain and showed him all the kingdoms of the world and their glory, and he said to him, "All these things I will give you if you will fall down and worship me." Then Jesus said to him, "Away with you, Satan! for it is written,

'You shall worship the Lord your God,

And him only shall you serve.' " — *Matt. 4: 2-10.* (*Shorter Bible translation.*)

### I.

#### THE RELIGIOUS NEEDS OF THE MEN OF JESUS' DAY.

To understand and appreciate the work and teachings of Jesus it is necessary to appreciate the needs of the men and women to whom he spoke. Throughout all history men's

faith regarding God and his relation to them has been powerfully influenced by their own political life and organization. With the exception of one brief period, supreme temporal authority during six centuries had been represented for the Jews by the mighty monarchies of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome. Potentates far removed from their subjects ruled through agents the civilized world. It was during this period that the Jews lost the simple faith of earlier days which recognized the divine principle and purpose in every event of their lives, and began to think of God as a far away potentate, jealous of his prerogatives, who must be obeyed and constantly served by ceremonial acts and formal gifts. This form of religion satisfied many types of mind but tended to destroy the spirituality and originality of its devotees. For the ordinary man it had become a mere formal routine. Prayer too was highly conventionalized and lacked personal inspiration. Public prayers were long and repetitious. The Judaism of Jesus' day lacked aspiration and spirituality.

Belief in their pre-eminence as the chosen people led many Jews to regard the rest of the world with scorn, as heathen beyond the pale of Jehovah's care. This sense of national self-sufficiency was felt in even a higher degree by the individual religious leaders. Those who could satisfy the rigorous demands of the ceremonial law were self-satisfied, and therefore lacked that hunger and thirst for righteousness which is essential for religious development. On the other hand the majority of the common people felt themselves the "lost sheep of the house of Israel." Thus in their religious life the Jews were divided into two classes; one spiritually self-satisfied, the other discontented and crushed by a pathetic consciousness of isolation. Both alike needed some one to show them how they might enter into vital touch with God. They also needed worthy ambitions to lift them out of the sordid, lifeless routine of daily life and ritual, and a re-affirmation of the teaching of the earlier prophets that man was not made for religion, but religion for man. They needed to be told with authority that religion is not merely a body of beliefs or a round of ceremonial acts, but that it is something personal and active expressed through individual motives and character and deeds. They needed to realize that genuine religion binds man to God and to his fellow men, enables him to meet the highest moral and social obligations,

satisfies his spiritual and æsthetic aspirations, and infinitely enlarges and enriches life.

How would you define theology? Why were our Puritan forefathers so deeply interested in theology? Why in the minds of many men of to-day is there such a strong reaction against theological thought and teaching? What are the vital religious interests of this generation? How do these interests find expression?

## II.

### THEIR PHYSICAL AND MORAL NEEDS.

Even more obvious and appealing than the religious were the physical and social needs of the men of Jesus' day. Asiatic countries had always been burdened by the sodden mass of those who were mentally and physically diseased. Hospitals and asylums were unknown. The demented wandered at large among the people. The blind and lame held out their pathetic hands at every turn for public charity. The dependent were the victims of precarious and pauperizing charity. The numbers of those physically or economically unfit had been increased in Jesus' day by cruel wars and the grinding burden of taxes imposed by the Romans and their unprincipled tools, the Herods. The public prisons were pest-holes in which the innocent as well as the guilty were treated worse than beasts.

Judaism had as yet developed little community spirit. In this respect the ancient Greek cities were far in the lead. The Jews too were the victims of their own party spirit. The dissensions of the Pharisees and the Sadducees had brought upon their nation the heavy yoke of Rome, and these dissensions were still dissipating the national strength. Patriotism chiefly took the form of intense, sullen hatred of Rome. Hatred and a burning sense of injustice are not sufficient to bind a people together and to inspire them to effective and noble achievement.

On the social side the education of the average Jewish youth was defective. The great social principles of the earlier prophets and lawgivers were largely neglected. Class feeling was intense. The exploitation of dependent classes was not confined to the Romans. The high priestly party that controlled the temple and conducted its ritual was even more culpable

in this regard than the despised tax-gatherers. The hands of even the learned religious teachers, the Pharisees, were not free from the taint of unjust extortion. Many interests which enlarge and enrich life, such as recreation, art, and popular music, were placed under the ban. As a result many a Jew satisfied his cravings for variety and pleasure in ways that were destructive to himself and to society. The ghastly effects of social immorality were evident on every side. What they needed, therefore, was healing of body and soul and a clear knowledge of the fundamental laws of life. They needed wholesome recreation and an acquaintance with the conditions under which genuine happiness could be secured. They also needed community and national organization and practical ideals for which to live and strive. They needed constructive leadership that would help them to forget their race hatreds and class prejudices in the service of the community and humanity.

What do we mean by public spirit? What perils are inherent in a selfish nationalism? Cf., Germany or the Balkan States before the Great War. What qualities are essential to a wholesome national spirit? How does national hate affect the relations of nations for good or ill? How do class hatreds affect the development of genuine national patriotism?

### III.

#### THE WAY IN WHICH JOHN THE BAPTIST TRIED TO MEET THESE NEEDS.

Three great prophetic souls stood forth about the beginning of the Christian era and valiantly combatted the evils inherent in Judaism. They were Hillel, John the Baptist, and Jesus. Of these Hillel was the pioneer and John the Baptist the immediate forerunner of Jesus. John was keenly alive to the more obvious religious and social needs of his age and devoted himself to meeting them with superb zeal and enthusiasm. Although reared a priest, he violently repudiated the dominating ceremonialism. Intimate knowledge had clearly revealed to him its evils. He frankly and fully adopted the principles and methods of the earlier social prophets of his

race. Boldly he declared that the axe was already laid at the roots of the tree and that the downfall of Judaism was certain unless fundamental reforms were speedily instituted.

Like the great prophet Ezekiel, John the Baptist employed striking and dramatic methods in order to win a popular hearing. He adopted the life of an ascetic as a protest against the superficial luxury and licentiousness that prevailed throughout many classes in Palestine. He lived on the borders of the Judean desert and by the fiery vigor of his preaching and the intensity of his personality and convictions drew all classes to him. His message was primarily one of repentance, and he symbolized the rejection of the old life of sin and deliverance from its baneful habits by the priestly symbol of baptism through immersion. John believed and frankly taught that a new era was about to dawn and that a prophetic teacher far more potent and spiritual than he was soon to appear, but he himself worked primarily for social and moral reform. His method was positive as well as negative. He not only protested against the cruelty and tyranny of the military class, but he influenced many of them to be content with their wages and to protect rather than pillage the people. He sought to right economic wrongs by influencing those who had, to share their possessions with those who lacked. Thus John not only echoed the teachings of Amos, Isaiah, and Hillel, but also anticipated in part those of Jesus. He taught that repentance to be genuine must change the life of the individual and bear fruits.

John the Baptist laid the foundation for a new social order both by his preaching and by training a group of morally and socially minded citizens. He organized his followers into a brotherhood which embodied and illustrated the moral and social principles which he proclaimed. He fully merited Jesus' statement that among the prophets of the older order he stood pre-eminent.

What were the reasons for John's popularity as a preacher? Why did not the Jewish authorities at Jerusalem openly oppose his work? What would be the effect should John the Baptist appear with a similar message and method in one of our great American cities?

## IV.

## JESUS' APPRECIATION OF THESE VITAL NEEDS.

For more than a quarter of a century Jesus lived in Nazareth in close and sympathetic touch with the people of Galilee. His frequent visits to Jerusalem had given him a clear appreciation of the universal needs of mankind. Many of these needs he had doubtless recognized in his own experience. In the laboratory of his own life he alone had learned how they might be fully satisfied. John the Baptist appealed to him, because that intrepid son of the South had awakened him to a full realization of the same needs. Jesus was drawn to John because he was boldly and unselfishly endeavoring to free the people from their narrow prejudices and beliefs and from the consequences of their own wrong acts and habits which had enmeshed them. John's sturdy personality, his intrepid spirit, and his bold methods, all commanded Jesus' admiration. He recognized too, as had John, that the message and the methods of the Baptist would never completely satisfy the deepest cravings of the human soul. John was the "voice of one crying in the wilderness, 'Make straight the ways of the Lord.'" The very incompleteness of John's message and method were a challenge to Jesus to carry on to complete fulfillment the work of this noble prophet, as well as that of those who had preceded him. Jesus saw clearly that some one must simplify and spiritualize the popular conception of God and of man's relation to him, thus breaking the bondage and revealing the superficiality of mere ceremonialism and giving to each man an opportunity to express himself in service to his fellow men. He realized that, before the Jews could be free, some great teacher must help them to conquer their intense class prejudices and hatreds and to substitute for their narrow nationalism an appreciation and love for God and humanity.

What characteristics did Jesus and John share in common? What personal qualities did Jesus possess that John lacked? What larger opportunities to appreciate man's deeper needs did Jesus have than John? What men and women of this generation have shown themselves most appreciative of these deeper needs of mankind? Are they always found in the churches?

## V.

## JESUS' CONSCIOUSNESS OF A CALL TO SERVE.

Men will long continue to discuss whether Jesus' call was natural or supernatural. Many will find in his training, in his unique experiences, and in the recognition of the needs of mankind, sufficient to explain that consciousness of a divine mission which appears in many of his sayings. The answer to the question turns in part upon our conception of the personality of Jesus. The materialism of the pre-war period shrank from admitting the existence of anything beyond that which could be seen and interpreted in the light of scientific investigation and human experience. Recently our vision of life and of the universe has been greatly expanded and we are more ready to recognize the existence of unseen facts and forces. The Biblical writers clearly believed in Jesus' pre-existence. His teachings reveal a wider vision of the totality of life than that vouchsafed to ordinary men. Is it not possible that his consciousness of a unique call to serve mankind was also because he saw not merely a small arc but the whole or a large part of life and of the universe? Latent in his consciousness may there not have been memories of a previous existence or at least experiences which alone satisfactorily explain that absolute conviction and calm certainty with which he answered the stupendous questions which perplex the mind of man? Certainly the attitude of open-mindedness toward these possibilities is alone truly scientific.

It is not entirely clear when the definite consciousness of his mission came to him. The earliest gospel narrative implies that it was when he joined John the Baptist beside the Jordan. Mark also states that the message which identified him as the Son of God and proclaimed the divine approval was directed not to the people but to Jesus himself. Even though the consciousness of a call to a great task had gradually dawned upon him, the baptism marks a great decision which transformed the builder of Nazareth into the Builder of men. From that time on his entire time and energies are devoted to this larger task. The Son of God has become the son and servant of men. The problems which henceforth concern him are problems of method rather than of mission. Jesus' conception of that mission is perhaps best revealed in the oldest records,

in his memorable words uttered evidently under great emotion, when the disciples returned with the report that their missions had been successful. "I praise thee, Father, Lord of heaven and earth, that thou hast hidden these things from the wise and the learned, and that thou hast revealed them to those who are untaught; yes, Father, for such has been thy gracious purpose. Everything has been revealed to me by my Father, and no one knows the Son but the Father, nor does any one know the Father except the Son and him to whom the Son will reveal him." (*Matt. 11: 25-27.*)

Why does not the fact that Jesus went to John represent a confession of sin? What were Jesus' motives in so doing? What evidence is there that Jesus worked with John the Baptist until the latter was imprisoned by Herod Antipas? If Jesus had been a modern western teacher, how would he have described his experience when baptized by John? In how far is the experience of every man who feels the call to an avocation, as well as a vocation, parallel to that of Jesus?

## VI.

### THE TEMPTATIONS WHICH CONFRONTED JESUS.

The story of Jesus' temptations has many points of contact with the familiar account of Isaiah's decision as recorded in the sixth chapter of his prophecy. In such passages we, with our western literalism, are always in danger of not grasping the essential truths which were intuitively revealed to the mind of the Oriental. We prefer abstract statement, but the Oriental can best understand the symbol.

The three types of temptation in the gospel story are closely related. Each is abundantly exemplified in the record of Jesus' ministry. Unlike John the Baptist, Jesus was fond of friends and social life and intercourse. To fulfill the strenuous mission to which he felt himself called and to meet the crying and varied needs of humanity, he recognized that he must largely turn his back upon wealth and its pleasures, upon the joys of the home, the fireside, the banquet, and of those quiet friendships which he in common with all men both craved and appreciated. Should he use his time and his gifts in securing and enjoying these more personal pleasures or should he devote himself wholly and completely

to his diviner task? This, like all of the temptations which came to Jesus, was common to every normal son of man.

The temptation to cast himself down from the pinnacle of the temple, and thus to satisfy the demands of the people who were continually asking him for some miraculous sign, was distinctly the type of temptation which comes to a man with lofty and worthy ambitions, who in his eagerness to accomplish his work is tempted to use methods which might perhaps in the popular mind be justified by the end, but are exaggerated and sensational. When the learned Pharisees came to Jesus and presented this temptation in definite form, he met it with the answer that like Jonah he would not appeal to their eyes but simply to their moral consciousness. Throughout his ministry Jesus refused to use sensational methods in order to accomplish his mission. In all his work and teaching he refused to accept the fallacious doctrine, sometimes adopted even by his so-called followers, that "the end justifies the means." Not as the national Messiah of popular hopes, not by miraculous signs, but by planting in the minds of men moral, social, and spiritual principles, did the Son of God accomplish his divine mission among men.

The last temptation was still more insidious. It was the temptation of a strong soul to accomplish his work by means of compromise. It is the temptation which comes to every man to-day who undertakes a worthy task. Sometimes the devil comes in the guise of vested interests; sometimes his argument is loyalty to family or party; he has even been known to wear garments sacerdotal. More than ease and wealth,—fame, success, popularity, even the exercise of personal power of rule seemed to await Jesus at certain points in his ministry if he would but ignore or condone the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and the underhanded graft of the priests, and join in their struggle for power, thus winning immunity from their secret intrigues and their open opposition and gaining their aid to promote powerful leadership, if not against Rome, at least to advance his people's temporal power. Not without a struggle and yet firmly, Jesus rejected these insidious temptations, and his words and deeds reveal his clear conviction, even from the beginning of his ministry, of the greatness, breadth and importance of his mission, a mission to conquer the hearts and souls of men, not to dominate their temporal interests.

If Jesus had been speaking to a group of modern psychologists and philosophers, how would he probably have described the temptations? What forms do these three types of temptations assume in the life of the ordinary man to-day? In how far are they the types of temptation peculiar to those devoted to religious and social work? In what way may the modern church to-day be yielding to the same temptations? Why was it necessary that Jesus overcome these temptations in order to accomplish his mission? How far does the same principle apply to the church of to-day?

*Subjects for Further Study.*

(1) How far have the different types of theology advanced and how far retarded the religious development of mankind? Cite historical examples.

(2) In what respects were the social needs of Jesus' day similar to those in America to-day?

(3) Give, with the aid of the meager gospel records and in the light of the political, religious, and social conditions in the Palestine of his day, an imaginary sketch of the psychological development of John the Baptist in the period preceding his public ministry.

(4) How far did the teachings of John the Baptist anticipate those of Jesus?

(5) What was the origin of John's symbol of baptism? Cf., *Hast. Dictionary of Christ and the Gospel*, I, pp. 863, 864; *Encyc. Biblica.*, I, pp. 471, 472.

(6) Compare Jesus' experience during his baptism and temptation with those of Isaiah as recorded in Isaiah 6.

(7) Compare the different interpretations of the account of Jesus' temptations presented in Montefiore, *The Synoptic Gospel*, II, pp. 465-470; Holtzmann, *Life of Jesus*, pp. 144-154; Ross, *The Universality of Jesus*, pp. 57-67; and Jenks, *Social Significance of the Teachings of Jesus*, p. 27.

## CHAPTER II.

### JESUS' METHODS OF WORK.

*Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*, pp. 186-197.  
Follett, *The New State*, pp. 19-59.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 51-65.

As Jesus was passing along the shore of the Sea of Galilee, he saw Simon and Andrew his brother casting their nets into the sea, for they

were fishermen. Jesus said to them, "Come with me, and I will make you fishers of men." Thereupon they left their nets and followed him. And going a little farther on, he saw James, the son of Zebedee, with John his brother, who were in their boat mending their nets. He called them at once, and they left their father Zebedee in the boat with the hired men, and went with him. — *Mark 1: 16-20.*

And Jesus appointed twelve to accompany him and to go out to preach, with authority to cast out evil spirits. — *Mark 3: 14.*

Come to me, all you who labor and are heavily burdened, and I will give you rest. Take my yoke upon you and learn of me, for I am kind and sympathetic, and you will find peace for your souls, for my yoke is easy and my burden light. — *Matt. 11: 28-30.* (*Shorter Bible translation*).

## I.

### JESUS' ADAPTATION OF HIS METHODS TO DIFFERENT SITUATIONS AND INDIVIDUALS.

(Jesus was bound by no rigid rules, and yet a marvellous method is revealed in all his works.) It was so simple, so direct, and so natural that it never obtruded. For this reason it is difficult to define. Its chief characteristic is its perfect adaptation to every changing situation. At first he began his public work with John the Baptist, and allied himself with his disciples and adopted John's method of preaching. Even after he returned to Galilee he continued for a time to proclaim John's ringing message: "The time has come; the rule of God is at hand. Repent." (Mark 1:15). But to John's austere message Jesus added, as he took up his Galilean work, the joyful, positive note: "Believe in the good news." Henceforth Jesus abandoned John's method of compelling people to come to him; instead he went to them. Wherever they were found ready to listen, he spoke to them. Sometimes it was in the synagogue, where he as a traveling preacher was asked to interpret the Prophets. Some of his most effective teaching was done at banquets where he ate and talked and feasted with the host and the other guests. When the supercilious Pharisees and Sadducees plied him with captious questions, he not only parried them but improved the opportunity to drive home some of his most vital teachings. Thus, for example, when the Pharisees asked him whether they should pay tribute to Cæsar, convinced that whatever answer he made he would be convicted of disloyalty either to Judaism or to Rome, he not

only escaped the trap set for him but also laid down the broad principle: "Pay to Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's and to God the things which are God's." A greedy man's request that Jesus act as arbiter in his behalf gave the Master Teacher an opportunity to present one of his most important teachings regarding the value and limitations of wealth (Luke 12: 13-21). The pathetic case of a woman convicted of adultery enabled Jesus to shake the smug self-satisfaction of the conventional religious leader of his race, and to teach the poor victim of her own sins certain fundamental laws of life (John 8: 1-11). Even the events that gathered about Jesus' trial and crucifixion were made by him the means whereby he emphasized the essential principles of life and death in a way never to be misunderstood or forgotten by mankind. Life on its many sides presented no situation which he was not able to utilize in accomplishing his mission.

Jesus showed equal skill in adapting his method to each individual. With the learned Pharisees and scribes he discussed the intellectual and moral problems with which they were chiefly concerned. With the common people and with his followers he talked of current events; as for example, the fall of the tower of Siloam; and thus established a natural point of contact before he led them on to the consideration of the great truths which he was eager to fix in their minds. In this personal, direct way Jesus appears to have adapted his teachings to all classes: learned scholars, royal stewards, Roman centurions, farmers, fishermen, and even to the despised tax-gatherers and women of the street. Every human contact became an open door through which he entered their minds and hearts.

How far did Paul imitate his Master in adapting himself to all men? Compare his own testimony in I Corinthians 9: 19-22. How far is the Christian church to-day in this respect following the example of its founder? Why has it often failed to reach the poor and manual laboring classes to which Jesus especially appealed? How would the life of the ordinary Christian be transformed, if, like Paul, he utilized every personal contact as an opportunity for practical helpfulness?

## II.

## HIS APPEAL TO HUMAN INTEREST.

Jesus was not content simply to utilize the opportunity which came to him through chance contacts; he won a permanent place in the hearts of those he wished to reach. He knew the subjects in which all men were interested and constantly used them in gaining their attention and confidence. The familiar story of the Prodigal Son is an excellent illustration of his remarkable skill in reaching all classes and interests. Youth finds in the clear-cut picture of the Prodigal the dramatization of its problems and temptations. The experiences and feelings of the father in the story arrest and hold the attention of every parent or guardian of youth.

We of the West have difficulty in fully appreciating the deep interest with which his Jewish audience listened to the story of the Good Samaritan. Priests, Levites, merchants, and every man, woman and child who had traveled the dangerous road down to Jericho felt a personal interest in the thrilling story as it rapidly unfolded. Jesus' boldness in making a Samaritan, the despised foe of every Jew, its hero piqued their curiosity and fixed their attention.

The evidence is clear that Jesus spared no effort to arouse the interest of all the different classes in his audiences. In the story of the man who found the treasure hidden in the field, he stirred the keen interest of every farmer and landholder who, like the citizens of Palestine to-day, never turned the soil without hoping to uncover a treasure hidden or left there by the countless thousands who in the generations past had lived or fought over this much debated territory. To hold the attention of the women he told the companion story of the woman who lost one of the precious coins belonging to her marriage dowry, of her frenzied search for it, and of her uncontrolled joy when it was discovered. Thus the teaching which he wished to convey was fixed forever in the mind of every woman in his audience. In the same way he likened the growth of the Rule of God to that of a mustard seed and in so doing held the attention of the men in his audience, while to the women the corresponding figure of the leaven placed in a measure of meal made its indelible impression.

Jesus also developed in highest measure the rare gift of

putting himself in the other man's place. In imagination we can see him sitting beside Peter and Andrew, the fishermen, discussing the problems and prospects of their strenuous life, until they felt the warmth of his individual interest and the charm of his personality. Rapidly the suspicion with which they naturally regarded a stranger melted away until almost unconsciously they asked him to be their guest, and Jesus was taken henceforth into their homes and hearts. Possibly it was in the crowded marketplace that Jesus met Simon, the fiery Zealot who was burning with zeal to unsheathe the sword and avenge the cruel wrongs of his race by slaying the mercenaries of hated Rome. In the light of Jesus' utterances elsewhere we may be sure that he shared and probably voiced Simon's hot indignation over Roman cruelties and indignities; and yet we can hear him saying to Simon: "Violence never righted a social wrong. Follow me and I will show you a better way to free our race from the odious bondage."

How was it that Jesus first appealed to Judas Iscariot, the shrewd, crafty, successful business man whose interest clearly lay in the field of finance? Did Jesus begin by commanding him for his able use of his natural gifts? Jesus, like Judas, was well acquainted with practical business affairs. Probably to Judas, as to many another business man, he presented the practical as well as alluring possibility of storing up his treasure in the Bank of Heaven where it would be free from all risks and available not only in this life but throughout eternity. The gospel records make it clear that Jesus always fixed upon the interest that was uppermost in each man's mind and made that the guide to his higher development and achievement.

What subjects to-day are of primary human interest to boys and girls from twelve to sixteen years of age? Select three men or women from your acquaintance and try to determine the primary interest of each. How can these interests in each case be made the guide to higher social and spiritual efficiency? With the same aim, analyze your own major interests.

### III.

#### HIS ACTS OF HEALING.

Modern Protestant Christianity has been accustomed to pass over lightly Jesus' acts of healing; and yet these acts are

related in the oldest gospel and are supported by many of the best authenticated records. The New Testament writings give the impression that these acts of healing occupied a large part of the time of Jesus and his disciples. Jesus definitely asserts that they were not mere signs or credentials. When the scribes and Pharisees demanded that he show them a miraculous sign, he declared that the present generation was evil and unfaithful, lacking in honesty and confidence in others, and so demanded a sign. He added that he would give them no sign except that of the prophet Jonah, who preached the truth so effectively to the guilty men of Nineveh that they repented of their crimes (Matt. 12: 38, 39, 41).

It is evident that Jesus' acts of healing were spontaneous expressions of his love and sympathy for his fellow men. He healed because he possessed the power and saw a need that nothing else could at that time meet. He healed that he might establish points of contact and a basis for the genuine friendships which he was seeking to form with all classes of men. A deeper reason still is that he saw the necessity of laying the proper physical and mental foundation on which to build or rebuild character. He frankly proclaimed that one of his aims was to enable men to live the full and abounding life. To realize that aim it was important that every man should have perfect health and happiness. Jesus had found this perfect physical and spiritual health in his own experience, and he was not content until he had transmitted it to others. With that practical directness and superb sanity which characterizes all of his thinking, he realized that men must be well if they were to be best fitted for the arduous and divine task to which he was calling them. The first step, therefore, in making men whole was to remove all physical encumbrances, and this Jesus did with a simplicity and directness that won their hearts as well as their admiration.

When and why did the healing ministry largely disappear from the Christian church? What did Jesus mean when he declared that his followers would do greater works than he? In what ways do the physical and mental conditions of the individual affect his moral and spiritual state? To what extent is the converse true? How far is the claim of Christian Science

that sickness and suffering have no rightful place in God's universe valid? How can we heal the whole man as Jesus did? What Christian agencies in our modern civilization are working effectively to this end?

#### IV.

##### PERSONAL FRIENDSHIP AND DISCIPLESHIP.

It has been truly said, "Jesus had genius for friendship." The foundation of that gift was a keen and sympathetic understanding of the interests and motives not merely of men as a class but of each individual whom he made his friend. Its inspiration was a genuine interest in people and an intense desire to help each man to realize his highest possibilities. This task was made easy and natural by Jesus' genuine and spontaneous desire to make and to have friends and to be of greatest service. There is abundant evidence that he enjoyed friends, that he sought and needed their companionship, that certain men like Peter and John stood in a peculiarly close relationship to him. None, however, were outside the pale of his friendship, unless they themselves raised an insuperable barrier. In this respect Jesus has been recognized as a supreme democrat.

He held his friends to him by the closest possible bond. He addressed the disciples affectionately as "children" (Mark 10: 24) and "little children" (John 13: 33). At all times he showed the most thoughtful consideration for their happiness and comfort. Thus, Mark 6: 31 records that when so many were coming and going that his weary disciples could not find time even to eat, he said to them, "Come by yourselves to some quiet place and rest a while."

Jesus also held his friends by receiving gratefully from them whatever they had to give. Above all he taught them how to work together for a great and common cause. This was the secret of Jesus' power to win and hold his followers. Each man wishes instinctively to be a creator. The desire to make, to build, to achieve is a dominant characteristic of childhood and youth which in the later, maturing years becomes established and specialized. Jesus saw the latent possibilities in every man. More than that, he enabled individuals to see these possibilities, and then he so guided and trained them that they were able to fulfill their tasks in life. To his disciples he declared:

"You are the salt of the earth. You are the light of the world." Strange words to address to untutored fishermen and laboring men, but the event amply proved the truth of his statement. After friendship and teaching had prepared the way, Jesus said, on one never-to-be-forgotten occasion to Peter and Andrew, "I will make you fishers of men." Both the East and the West rise up to-day to bear testimony to the truth of these words.

The Gospel of Mark suggests the way in which he transformed the crooked, despised tax-gatherer, Levi, from a collector of money into a collector of human souls (2: 13-17). Contemporary Judaism treated the tax-collectors as dogs. Their testimony was not accepted in the public courts and no agreement made with them was binding. Since they had allied themselves with the hated Romans and had put their hands into the pockets of their fellow men, they and their families were looked upon as renegades. No self-respecting Jew was supposed to associate with them. Jesus won the devotion of Levi, the son of Alpheus, by publicly inviting himself to become his guest. Jesus and his disciples found themselves in a strange company made up chiefly of tax-collectors and outcasts. The scribes and Pharisees were horrified at the sight, but Jesus accomplished his double purpose. He thereby proclaimed by acts as well as words that he came to heal those who were sick both in soul and body, and to turn those sick of sin from their past and to inspire them to find that fullness of life which was their divine inheritance. At the same time, in making Levi his host Jesus evoked those nobler qualities latent within him. Jesus is indeed the supreme illustration of Lowell's immortal words:

"Be noble! and the nobleness that lies  
In other men, sleeping but never dead,  
Will rise in majesty to meet thine own."

It is significant that Jesus said little to men about the state of their souls. His sympathetic friendship or his words of encouragement revealed to them their potentialities, set before them a glorious task, and then guided them in achieving it. In so doing they broke with their sinful habits and their disreputable past. Levi, better known in the gospel narratives by his other name, Matthew, is such a transformed man. To

each of his followers Jesus gave the largest opportunity for a normal and natural self-development and self-expression. At the same time he demanded the complete loyalty and enthusiasm which he himself threw into all his work.

Among what classes did Jesus find it impossible to win many friends? What are the chief barriers to-day that keep men from becoming close friends? In what ways has the Great War promoted friendship between nations and individuals? How true is the proverb, "To win a friend you must be one"? If the church has in the past made a mistake in putting large emphasis on the state of a man's soul, and not enough on his failure to do the task to which he is divinely fitted, how can this mistake be corrected? Why and how does working together for a great cause develop friendship?

## V.

### PREACHING AND TEACHING.

Jesus was preeminently a teacher. He came from a race that had always given a prominent place to its teachers. With him preaching was only a net thrown out to draw men into the closer relationship of disciples. The so-called "Sermon on the Mount" was really a talk with the disciples as they sat together on the hillside above Capernaum. There is little exhortation in the records of Jesus' work. He taught men to know the truth, because he knew that the truth would make them free. His great endeavor was to open men's minds and teach them how to think. One of the severest charges that he brought against the crowds to which he spoke was that they were unable to interpret the signs of the time and to form right judgments (Luke 12: 56, 57). He constantly asked his disciples questions that made them think constructively. "What do you think that I am?" is typical of the large, incisive questions that he launched at them.

Jesus was constantly striving to induct his disciples into his spirit and method and point of view. To that end he encouraged them to ask questions. With him a question had the right of way. He always held himself at their disposal and welcomed their criticism, which they appear to have given freely (Matt.

13: 10, 15: 15). He even used paradoxes in order to provoke questions, as well as to drive home an important teaching. Frequently he left it with the disciples to formulate the principles illustrated by his concrete teachings; but whenever that was beyond their power, he gathered up his teaching in one broad, comprehensive statement. Simple, direct and positive are the statements of the great principles of life which have come down from him who spoke from the abundance of his heart. Little wonder that men marvelled at his words and that "the people all hung upon him, listening" (Luke 19: 48).

Make a list of Jesus' recorded questions and note their aim in each case. What questions did his disciples ask him? What advantage has the parable or short story over the direct form of teaching? What do you regard as the greatest of Jesus' short stories? What is the relative value of preaching and teaching to-day?

## VI.

### PERSONAL EXAMPLE AND SOCIAL METHOD.

Jesus illustrated the principle that goodness, if it be of the natural, spontaneous type, is contagious. Men, women, and children of all classes were drawn to him by his charm, and as they associated with him were gradually and unconsciously transformed. As Saint Augustine has said, "One loving spirit sets another on fire." We all, like children, irresistibly imitate that which we admire. With most people imitation and association are the most effective means of transforming character. Emerson has voiced the same great principle: "I am a part of all with which I associate." Jesus fully appreciated the value of this method. His disciples were his apprentices. When he sent them forth two by two, it was to test the result of his methods. His joy when he found the test successful was unrestrained.

Jesus also believed in system. His plan was so natural and practical that it has largely escaped the attention even of the most careful New Testament scholars. He was not content merely with proclaiming principles but was intent upon demonstrating their validity. This fact explains why he, a peasant from the upland town of Nazareth, went to the great city of

Capernaum and there did the major part of his work. It is evident that he chose this city because it was the center from which radiated the ancient international highways to Egypt on the south, to Phœnicia on the west, to Damascus and Syria on the north, and even to distant Rome and Babylonia. Jesus' great apostle Paul, in focusing his work on the strategic centers of the Roman Empire, developed no new policy but was simply following that already established by his Master.

Jesus chose Capernaum because it was also a great and representative community containing all types of men and women, and above all "the lost sheep of the house of Israel," those sick in body and soul who needed his help and appealed to his sympathy. The greater Capernaum with its suburbs, Chorazin and Bethsaida, was an ideal community in which to work out his social plan. That plan was evidently to train a group of individuals through friendship, through teaching, through inspiration and common work, to qualify as members in that brotherhood which Jesus sought to establish in the heart of the great city that, like leaven, it might in time permeate and transform the entire population. To this end he carefully selected his disciples from a great variety of classes, and with them as a nucleus built up what Professor Royce has felicitously called "the beloved community." Each individual was responsible for a task adapted to his peculiar ability. Love, co-operation, and good-will bound them closely together. In the face of want and opposition and misunderstanding, they lived a joyous life. The joy of that life sorely troubled the long-faced Pharisees. They bitterly complained that Jesus' followers never fasted. He frankly admitted the charge and likened their life together to a marriage feast, which in oriental life still represents the highest form of social recreation and happiness.

Jesus hoped that the greater Capernaum would prove the corner-stone in that new society which he was laboring to create. This hope is revealed in his closing words as he left that great city, driven forth by the envious Pharisees and the treacherous suspicions of Herod Antipas, "O Capernaum! had the marvellous deeds performed in you been done in Sodom, it would have remained standing until this day."

Jesus also labored in the hope that the social principles proclaimed and embodied in the life of the beloved community at Capernaum would spread throughout the bounds of Judaism.

This hope is clearly expressed in his pathetic address to Jerusalem, as he approached it for the last time: "O Jerusalem, Jerusalem! how often did I long to gather your children together as a hen gathers her brood under her wing, but you were not willing!" (Luke 13: 34). Jesus' attitude toward the representatives of the greater heathen world that lay outside Judaism and the activity of his later followers leave no doubt that his social plan embraced all mankind.

To-day the world is gaining a new appreciation of the breadth and practical character of that social plan. It begins with the training of the individual citizen. It is first developed in a definite neighborhood or community. It expands from the community centers until it permeates and transforms the nation. It does not reach its natural bound until it has brought together in one great harmonious family all the races of mankind. It rests squarely on the innate needs and characteristics of the individual and of society. It is practical and yet comprehensive. It depends not merely upon the leadership of the few but upon the co-operation of all. It develops the whole man and a perfect society. Jesus' method, therefore, alone meets in full measure the fundamental needs of the individual and of humanity.

If unconscious imitation is still one of the most effective means of extending Christianity, why have not Jesus' principles of living won universal acceptance? If America as a nation should not only nominally but actually adopt Jesus' principles of living, what would be the effect on the other nations of the world? What would be the effect if all the nominal Christians in your community should take this step? To what extent is Jesus' community plan applicable to your community?

#### *Subjects for Further Study.*

(1) Compare the teaching methods of Jesus with those of Socrates. (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, XXV, pp. 331-338; Graves, *History of Education before the Middle Ages*, pp. 180-184.)

(2) How far did Jesus anticipate the fundamental principles of modern education?

(3) What examples of humor are found in the records of Jesus' teachings? (Leonard, *The Poet of Galilee*.)

(4) Is the quest of souls the chief task of the Christian church or is it to help each individual to attain the highest possible development of his personality and his social efficiency? How far are the individual churches realizing their historic task?

(5) What principles have been illustrated by the work of the Emmanuel Church at Boston and by the healing ministry of James Moore Hickson? (Hickson, *The Healing of Christ in his Church; The Revival of the Gifts of Healing.*)

(6) To what do you attribute the phenomenal growth of the Christian Science movement and the devotion of its followers?

(7) What indications are there that physical and psychological laws and forces exist, but as yet only partially discovered, which, when fully known, will make clear the processes underlying Jesus' acts of healing?

(8) How far does the modern church realize the standards of a beloved community established by Jesus?

## CHAPTER III.

### GOD AND MAN.

#### *Parallel Readings.*

Glover, *The Jesus of History*, pp. 87-113.

Kent, *Historical Bible*, Vol. V., pp. 134-155.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 66-103.

Follett, *The New State*, pp. 60-92, 189-203.

I tell you, there will be more joy in heaven over one sinner who repents than over ninety-nine upright men who have no need to repent.—*Luke 15: 7.*

Ask and you will receive, seek and you will find, knock and the door will be opened to you; for every one who asks receives, and he who seeks finds, and to him who knocks the door will be opened.

What man is there among you, who if his son asks him for a loaf, will give him a stone? Or if he asks for a fish, will give him a snake? Then, if you, evil as you are, know how to give good gifts to your children, how much more will your Father in heaven give good things to those who ask him.—*Matt. 7: 7-11.*

And why be anxious about what you wear? Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow! they neither toil nor spin, and yet I tell you, not even Solomon in all his splendor was clothed like one of these. Now if God so clothes the grass of the field which is alive to-day but to-morrow is thrown into the oven, is it not far more certain that he will clothe you, O men of little faith?—*Matt. 6: 28-30.*

No man can serve two masters: either he will hate one and love the other, or else he will be loyal to one and despise the other. You cannot worship God and wealth.—*Matt. 6:24.*

Two men went up to the temple to pray; one was a Pharisee and the other a tax-gatherer.

The Pharisee stood up in front and prayed by himself as follows: "I

thank thee, O God, that I am not like other men — thieves, rogues, adulterers, or even like this tax-gatherer. Twice a week I fast; on all my income I pay tithes."

But the tax-gatherer stood far back and would not even lift his eyes to heaven, but kept beating his breast and saying, "O God, have mercy on me, a sinner!" I tell you that this man rather than the other went home free from sin; for he who assumes honors for himself will be humiliated, but he who does not put himself forward will be honored. — *Luke 18: 10-14.* (*Shorter Bible* translation.)

## I.

### THE FATHERHOOD OF GOD.

It is significant that Jesus does not attempt to define God or to describe his character in detail. He presents no developed system of theology. His direct statements regarding God in the three oldest gospels are confined to four: "No one is good except the one: God" (Mark 10: 18); "Everything is possible with God" (Mark 10: 27); "God is the God not of the dead but of the living" (Mark 12: 27). Again in emphasizing the primary importance of loving God, Jesus reaffirmed the fundamental tenet in Israel's faith: "Our God is one God" (Mark 12: 29). In each case these statements are precipitated by questions addressed to Jesus and are simply incidental to the discussion of subjects that have no direct theological import. They clearly reveal, however, his own fundamental convictions.

As has already been noted, in one striking passage in Matthew (11: 27, 28) he declares his own consciousness of a unique knowledge of God. "Everything has been revealed to me by the Father, and no one knows the Father except the Son and him to whom the Son will reveal him." This unique feature in Jesus' personality is reiterated in the Gospel of John: "He whom God has sent speaks the message of God. He testifies to what he has seen and heard" (3: 34, 32). The author of that Gospel thoroughly believed and plainly taught that the key that unlocks the mystery was Jesus' pre-existence and the memories derived from his larger vision of the universe. (3: 31-35; 8: 42, 58). Through the intervening centuries a majority of his followers have held to the belief in his pre-existence.

Jesus did not impose his own convictions regarding God on his followers. He sought rather to open their eyes so that each should see for himself the evidence of God in the world,

and thus build his faith on realities. In two memorable passages he calls their attention to this evidence (Matt. 6: 25-32; 10: 28-30): "Consider how the birds of the air neither sow nor reap, yet your heavenly Father feeds them. Not one sparrow falls to the ground without your Father's knowledge. As for you, the very hairs of your head are all numbered."

Jesus, with the scientific mind that observed facts closely, evidently saw, through the seen and experienced, that which is unseen and eternal. Like the author of the story of creation in the first chapter of Genesis, he recognized that the purpose revealed in nature and in life was good. With his larger and clearer knowledge of the universe, the facts that in our narrow vision apparently challenge the justice and goodness of that purpose did not disturb him. He declared that the growing tares could not prevent the ultimate harvest. Men might stay for a time the realization of that good purpose, but not only was it good in itself, but to the open-minded it revealed him who alone is absolutely good. Thus from the contemplation of the realities of life Jesus led men back to the ultimate reality which is God.

The vivid consciousness of a kindly purpose back of all the phenomena of the natural world and extending throughout the universe and eternity was clearly the foundation of the religion that Jesus taught and is the corner stone of all real religion. That belief he made clear and vivid to his followers by describing God as the Father. That term, so rich in its human associations, suggested far more than the work of creation: it suggested, as Jesus made clear by a variety of homely illustrations, constant and intelligent provision for the needs of all created things whether they be the lilies of the field or a king on his throne.

It suggests too by the clearest logic that love, not mere force, rules the universe. This is the central truth powerfully set forth in the story of the Prodigal Son. The irrepressible love of the father toward his guilt-stained son almost shocks those who have sat at the feet of the Puritans. Our conventional belief in divine justice leads us unconsciously to sympathize with the plaint of the older brother. The joyous spontaneity of the father's reception of the prodigal, the absence of a single word of reproach or warning, and the hilarity of the merry feast at which the sinner is reinstated in his home

seem to us, as they did to the Pharisees, unbecoming to the God of our theologies. Like Jonah of old, we are tempted to reproach God because he forgives sinners so readily and loves all his creatures with a love so spontaneous and overwhelming that there is no place for reproaches and judicial punishments. But this was the quality in God which Jesus always stressed and exemplified in his own life and work. He sternly rebuked the leaders of the Jewish faith because by their conventional theology they loaded men with burdens too heavy to bear and shut in men's faces the door that opened to the Democracy of God; but for sinners he had only compassion and brotherly love.

Jesus left men to discover by what means and through what forces, laws, agencies and agents the Father provides for man's every need and even for the sparrow when it falls to earth. To discover all these and the real character of God is the alluring quest, not merely of this short life, but of eternity. Jesus simply sent men forth on this quest and indicated the conditions necessary for success. Chief among these was purity of heart: characters unsullied by impure thoughts and motives, minds free from prejudice and bias. "Happy are the pure in heart for they shall see God," not through systems of abstract theology, but through nature and the infinite ways in which God is revealed to the man of unsullied vision.

Which do you think had a truer idea of God, Calvin or a North American Indian devoted to the worship of the Great Spirit? Give the reasons for your conclusion. What reasons are there for thinking that with the larger vision that comes when we leave behind our physical limitations we shall at once have a complete knowledge of God? What relation does scientific investigation in the field of nature hold to religion? Why is the dogmatic method even more dangerous in the field of religion than of natural science?

## II.

### CO-OPERATION BETWEEN GOD AND MAN.

Jesus was eager to have men view life from the divine rather than from the merely human point of view. When his disciples protested against his facing death at Jerusalem, he

declared, "You do not think the thoughts of God but of men." He was disappointed at their selfishness and lack of vision because he saw that God could not realize his good purpose in the world without men's intelligent co-operation. In the story of the Prodigal he dramatized the fact that the father was helpless in his effort to rear a worthy son until the son returned ready and eager to co-operate.

Like all inspired teachers Jesus knew that the freedom of the human will was one of the fundamental laws of the universe. This truth is not the least of those taught in this marvellous parable of the Prodigal. Even more impressive and astonishing than the forgiving love of the father is his fortitude in giving his son his share of the inheritance and in letting him go forth to a foreign land where he knew that his son would be exposed to powerful temptations. But the picture is true to reality. If we were making the laws of the universe most of us would probably give, especially to youth, far less freedom to make moral decisions than they now possess. But making decisions and bearing responsibility are the best, if not the only methods of training and strengthening the will, while freedom of the will is the only basis for intelligent and whole-hearted co-operation. We have every reason to believe that even the sin-stained but penitent prodigal on his return was able and eager to contribute far more to the welfare of his father's household than if he had been compelled to remain at home. Want of sympathy, of love, of friendship and of appreciation, as well as of food, had created in his famished soul a hunger and thirst for righteousness and a desire to co-operate with his father.

In one of the two greatest beatitudes Jesus describes those who are worthy to be called the sons of God. The term "Sons of God" arrests attention for it is the counterpart of Jesus' distinctive word "Father." The sons of God, he declares, are the peacemakers. Our current English translation almost completely fails to bring out the rich meaning of the original Aramaic. The word translated "peace" means welfare, completeness, prosperity, harmony. The sons of God are like God himself, creators of harmony, well-being, completeness in their own lives, in those of their fellows, in the family, in the community, in business, and in all the world. They are the ones who, by attempting through the imagination to make real to

themselves the purpose of God, think the thoughts of God, are guided by them and carry them into execution. Jesus conceived of religion as a recognition of God's good purpose and active co-operation in realizing it in the life of the individual, in society, and in the universe. It was more than a belief. It was a mental and moral attitude! It was not only an attitude; it meant enthusiastic, tireless activity.

In the light of these teachings regarding the co-operative relation between God and man, we can understand anew what Jesus meant when he said to his disciples: "You are the light of the world; you are the salt of the earth;" and also his enthusiasm in training men that they might fully qualify as sons of God. His message of good news was far more than a promise of pardon to guilty sinners. It was a ringing call to action, a summons to every man, however humble and weak he be, to assert his divine sonship and co-operate with the eternal Father in creating a perfect society and a perfect humanity. As a by-product every man who responds to this call saves his own soul: "He who loses his life in my cause shall gain it!"

What was the force of the Semitic idiom "son of" as used in the Old and New Testaments; *e.g.*, "sons of the prophets" or "sons of the goldsmith"? What tasks were left to men to perform in realizing what we believe to be the overruling, divine purpose in the Great War? What in developing a well-rounded individual character? Under what conditions is co-operation the most effective means of developing respect and love and loyalty toward those with whom we co-operate?

### III.

#### SIN.

In Jesus' practical philosophy of life sin was not only deliberate wrongdoing but also the failure of the individual to co-operate in the realization of the good purpose revealed in the world. It was the failure to seek first the rule of God in every relation of life. The priest and the Levite who passed by on the other side were arrant sinners simply because they failed to lend a hand when there was work to be done. The

despised Samaritan qualified as a son of God because he quietly improved an opportunity to bring health and healing to a needy fellow man. In the memorable passage in Matthew 25: 31-46 in which, under the figure of a final judgment scene, Jesus describes the supreme test of loyalty, he stresses the fact that men are called to co-operate with God not in some spectacular, mysterious way, but in the commonplace daily relationships. Those who give food to the hungry, water to the thirsty, or clothing to the naked receive the divine approval. Those who neglect to do so are the sinners, even though they bear the label of sons. Even the man with one talent was classed with the social outcasts simply because he had failed to use it.

Sin, according to Jesus, was also a failure so to develop the individual man that his spirit would rule his body and control his physical passions and lower impulses (Matt. 5: 27, 28). To qualify for efficient co-operation by gaining and keeping control of self is therefore the first responsibility of youth. Most individuals begin by letting the physical impulses rule the spirit. Like the poor prodigal they only learn in the painful and terribly expensive school of experience the lesson that Jesus was trying to teach in a far simpler and better way. He also taught that the rule of the spirit over the physical impulses must be achieved at any cost. "If your hand or foot cause you to sin, cut it off and throw it away, for it is better for you to begin at once to live the eternal life than to retain your two hands and two feet and be cast into the eternal fire" (Matt. 18: 8). If Jesus were speaking in the technical language of to-day he would perhaps say, instead of "cast into the eternal fire," "Be forced to attend the harsh school of experience where you will be compelled to learn the painful lesson of consequences."

In his simple but searching analysis of sin, Jesus also recognized that in the maturer years the old physical selfishness assumed more respectable forms, such as the quest of wealth or power; but he laid it bare: "A man cannot serve both God and wealth" whether he be a despised tax-gatherer or a sleek, self-satisfied Pharisee, or a grafting high priest. He denounced these traitorous misleaders of their race most rigorously, because public opinion and their own consciences had failed to do it for them. In so doing he performed for them the greatest possible service. He turned hopefully to the tax-

gatherers and the outcasts because they were already self-condemned and under the deep shadow of public disapproval, and therefore ready to listen to the new principles of living that he propounded. Looking at life not from the harsh, mechanical point of view of Jewish theology but "thinking the thoughts of God," he told them of a love that followed them even though they had wandered far in strange lands, a love that would welcome them when once they had learned the folly of sin and loathed it and were ready to do their part in carrying out the divine purpose in their lives and in the life of humanity. Above all he told them of the supreme joy in heaven over one sinner that had learned the bitter lesson of consequences and stood ready to serve rather than oppose the realization of God's good purpose.

In the teachings of Jesus, sin and its grim consequence to the sinner, to humanity, and to the Source of all life are hideous realities. But that is not all. He taught that sin could be forgiven and the lost saved by self-conquest and gaining the will to co-operate in God's work for humanity. As has been said, the lost were the detached, those who by their own sins or the sins of society had either broken all connections or had never established them with their fellow men and had no sense of co-operation with their divine Father. In saving the lost, as for example in the case of Levi the tax-gatherer, Jesus by his friendship and his wholesome teaching broke down the barriers that separated them, introduced them to a community of men who were seeking first the Rule of God, and then taught them by skillful apprenticeship how they too could co-operate with God.

Who in Jesus' eyes were the chief sinners in the Jewish community? In what respects did his judgment on this point differ from that of the majority of his Jewish contemporaries? What was the reason for the different judgments? Why are there the same differences in judgment to-day? What crimes are most severely punished by modern law? What classes of arrant sinners, according to Jesus' standards, still escape the condemnation both of law and public opinion? In what respects could our modern methods of dealing with criminals be conformed more closely to Jesus' ways of saving sinners? What place did Jesus give to the social consequences of sin?

## IV.

## THE ESSENTIALS OF WORSHIP.

The greater part of the time and the religious zeal of the Jews of Jesus' day was devoted to acts of worship. With this formal interpretation of religion he had no sympathy. Nowhere is it recorded that he brought sacrifices to the temple. The Pharisees condemned him because he did not teach his followers to observe the ceremonial regulations laid down in the later Jewish law. He replied that externals made no difference; what was vital was the inner spirit and motive. In general, Jesus appears to have silently ignored the entire Jewish ceremonial system without condemning that which doubtless proved helpful to some.

He did, however, warn his followers against the evils of certain ostentatious forms of worship. Acts of charity stand first in his list as valid ways by which the individual can express his gratitude and loyalty to God. But, as he taught, if these are performed with a view to winning men's rather than God's approval, they have no value as worship, for worship is a personal relation between the individual and God. So too he condemned fasting in public; in fact he apparently had little sympathy with the institution itself, for it stressed the sad interpretation of religion. The fasting which he recommended was no real fasting in the popular sense of the word, but that happy, joyous expression of religion that characterized all of his teaching. "As at a wedding feast, with happy hearts, express not in public but in private your gratitude and loyalty to your heavenly Father."

There was no doubt in Jesus' mind of the value of real worship. Reverence, faith, love, gratitude and loyalty, which are the emotions that enter into true worship, are necessary if the soul of the individual is to grow; and these emotions, which are the incentives to right action, develop by exercise. The value of the different forms of worship depends upon the way in which they affect each individual. The essentials, therefore, are (1) that they shall be joyous, (2) that they shall be natural and sincere, and (3) that they bring the individual into close personal relation to God. By his own example, as well as by his teachings, Jesus taught the importance of going apart from the distractions of daily life. He usually

went out on the hillsides or mountain tops where undisturbed he could come into closest touch with God's spirit and purpose as revealed in the life of the flowers and birds and all the beauties of nature. But he declared that the chief essential is purity of heart, for only those who are free from prejudice and the consciousness of doing wrong and of being out of accord with his good purpose, are able to see him in nature, in human history, in the lives of men. Above all only as God is sought in the inner chamber, the soul of the individual, can man truly worship him. When in these various ways the individual gains a clear vision of God the ultimate reality, he can but worship.

How do you explain the absence in Jesus' teachings of any detailed directions regarding public worship? Were the forms of public services in the early Christian Church of Jewish or Christian origin? In what sense, if at all, is the prominence now given to public worship in the Christian Church a reversion to the Pharisaic usage that Jesus condemned? How far is the modern church adapted to the type of worship that Jesus commended? Where else do you feel most naturally and strongly the spirit of worship? Why do people attend church? Why do many not attend church? How can the worship of the modern church be still further reorganized so as to realize the essentials stressed by Jesus?

## V.

### FAITH AND PRAYER.

The ordinary experiences of life prove that successful co-operation is impossible without confidence and mutual understanding. If this rule holds good in the case of individuals who share common characteristics, in a far greater degree does it apply to beings so widely different as God and man. One of Jesus' first aims was to help men to know God intimately, to think the same thoughts as God, and to trust him. In teaching the lesson of faith he appealed to logic based on reality. You can see with your own eyes the lilies and the birds and note their serene joy and confidence based on experience. Thus the natural world proclaims the wisdom and goodness of the great Source of all. Little indeed is the faith and defective the logic of those who do not, like the birds and flowers, trust

and in turn find the confidence and serenity essential to effective co-operation.

With Jesus, prayer was not so much a means of securing certain definite things, as a way in which the individual could bring his feelings and thoughts and purposes into close, harmonious relation to the feelings and thoughts and purposes of God. This is the dominant aim throughout the wonderful prayer that he taught his disciples: "Our Father" reminded them of all that Jesus had taught them about God's fatherly care and of the bond of love and gratitude that bound them to the great Source of all. "May thy name be revered" inspired reverence in every praying heart. "May thy rule be established" kindled the flame of loyalty and stirred to action. "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven" not only defined God's rule but emphasized the unity of earth and heaven, of the present and eternity, and was equivalent to an oath of unending fealty to the Eternal. "Give us to-day the food we need" is not so much a petition as it is a declaration of confidence in God's goodness and wisdom in providing whatever things are necessary for his children. "Forgive us our wrongdoings as we have forgiven those who have wronged us" is a prayer that God will remove all barriers separating him from his children. It is also a solemn promise that they will remove all barriers separating them from their fellow men, thus creating harmony in the mind of those who pray and the consciousness of friendship with God and with all their fellows. "Help us to resist temptation and deliver us from evil" completes the bond between God and men, and unites them in unceasing opposition to all that hinders the realization of his good purpose.

In Jesus' discussion of prayer as a form of worship he emphasized the same aim. He characterized the long public prayers of the Pharisees not as real prayers but as public displays. In the light of his searching analysis they were shown to be no more religious than the public games in the stadium. Prayer, he declared, is, like all other forms of worship, a personal relation between the individual and God. If it is to be effective men must forget themselves and the approval or disapproval of their fellow men. The man who would truly pray must enter the inner sanctuary of his own soul and lose himself through absorption in a purpose; there he will find God and the true answer to the prayer that voices that purpose.

On the basis of his own experience Jesus had unbounded faith in prayer when the object of the petition is in keeping with God's good purpose. No worthy petition shall be refused; no quest for truth shall be in vain; no door in God's boundless universe shall be closed to a son of God who asks with faith. To strengthen the faith of his disciples he assured them, with all the power of his own personal experience and deep conviction, that love far greater than that of a human father lies back of the power to give. Mere repetitions of their petitions are useless, for the Eternal is well aware of their wants! What is essential is concentration of thought and determination to be heard. This at least is the natural interpretation of the parable of the importunate widow whose persistency won her point. Beyond this one suggestion Jesus did not discuss the psychology of prayer, or if he did, his words fell on dull ears and found no record in the Gospels.

To secure results faith is much more important than a knowledge of the ways in which our persistent prayers react upon the Source of all and in turn are answered. Jesus knew that his own prayers were answered, both in the physical and spiritual realm, although it is true the Gospels frankly tell us of one conditioned petition which was not answered: "If it is thy will" (Mark 14: 36). Not only his early apostles but his followers throughout the ages, who have prayed the loyal prayer of faith, have had the definite consciousness that their petitions have been heard. This fact rests on as solid and broad a basis of observation and experience as any law in the natural world. Jesus' teachings regarding prayer have stood the crucial tests. They must, however, be taken as a whole. There are petitions which no loyal son of God can ask. There are others, like Jesus' agonized request in the Garden of Gethsemane, which can be asked only conditionally, for no co-worker with God would persistently ask for that which is not in accord with the good purpose to which he is pledged. Within these broad bounds it is evident that there is a vast range of physical and mental and spiritual gifts for which men have but to ask with faith and concentration and determination in order to receive.

The promise, "knock and it shall be opened to you," undoubtedly applies to the unseen as well as the seen. Because we do not to-day understand the psychology of prayer and the

unseen spiritual laws that are only dimly suggested by the physical is no reason why exact knowledge may not in time take the place of our profound ignorance. Gradually the fact is dawning upon us that thoughts are as real forces as gravity or dynamite. The thoughts of God, of which Jesus said so much, we may well believe are infinitely more potent. It is possible that Jesus' earnest desire that his followers should think the thoughts of God was that their thoughts might reinforce those of God and that these reinforced thoughts had in the language of the Master power to move mountains.

In the age just past we had in our thinking largely reduced the universe to a material mechanism. Is it possible that we were looking simply at the form and that reality is a complex of spiritual forces and agents which, if we but knew, makes prayer and its answer far simpler than the faith which leads us, for example, to go to a telephone receiver and ask and receive the aid of a friend living thousands of miles away? At least, in the new age just dawning we have already become so scientific that we are willing to investigate and wait for the psychological and scientific explanation of the basis of Jesus' teachings regarding prayer. Most of us are also ready to accept those teachings as a practical working basis, even though we are as yet unable to trace the subtle connections between the cause and the effect.

What is the object and value of the long prayers in the public services of most of our Christian churches? In what ways may they become a menace to true worship? What are the values and perils of definite habits of prayer, such as daily family prayers and giving thanks before meals? What are some of the objects for which no Christian should pray? What are some of the valid subjects of prayer? What examples of seemingly definite answers to prayer have you had in your own experience?

## VI.

### THE ETERNAL LIFE.

Jesus was so completely a son of reality that he did not spend any time or effort in proving such realities as God, sin, and immortality. They were even more real than the disciples

whom he gathered about him. His own firm belief in eternal life for the individual was precipitated by a captious question raised by the conservative Sadducees who still cherished the old Semitic skepticism about individual immortality (Mark 12: 18-27). Their immediate object was to make Jesus ridiculous and so to weaken his influence with the common people. The question itself was ridiculous: "A woman six times widowed married in succession seven brothers; when they all rise from the dead whose wife will she be?" The words "rise from the dead" were probably said mockingly, for they echo the current, and to the Sadducees hostile, Pharisaic doctrine of a physical resurrection. Jesus in his incisive answer quietly rejected both the childish belief of the Pharisees and the negative attitude of the Sadducees. In effect he said: "In the life after death men do not go on marrying, for they do not take with them their physical bodies but, like the angels, have spiritual bodies. But in regard to the whole question of life after death, have you Sadducees never read how God said to Moses: 'I am the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob.' That was said long after the patriarchs had left this world. I tell you, God is not the God of those who are dead but of the patriarchs who are still living. You are greatly in error."

In all his teachings Jesus emphasized the fact that the individual commenced to live the eternal life the moment that he began to acknowledge the rule of God. Eternal life is, as is taught in the Gospel of John (6: 27), something to be attained through following the guidance of Jesus. In his thought the barrier between this life and that beyond is so thin that he ignores it in his teachings regarding the Rule of God, for in that divine democracy are included all the living and "those who have fallen asleep" that are devoted to realizing God's good purpose in the universe. In the full light of Jesus' teachings his early followers never spoke of their friends as dead; death was but a short and peaceful sleep with a glad awakening.

The best authenticated records of Jesus' own activity in the days following his resurrection also state simply and clearly, as though it were the most natural event in all his thrilling life history, that he repeatedly passed the barriers of death and appeared and talked with his disciples. Paul, his most highly educated and gifted follower, believed with all his heart not

only that Jesus appeared to him on his memorable journey to Damascus, but that the spirit of his Master guided him in all his work and prompted his greatest teachings.

Jesus' philosophy of life definitely teaches that God is not limited by the material and temporal and that love and friendship and the spiritual life of the individual simply begin in this world and go on expanding and developing eternally in the unexplored realm that lies beyond man's last sleep on earth.

How far does Paul in I Corinthians 15 correctly interpret what appears to be Jesus' teaching regarding the life of the individual after death? How far do these teachings agree with the findings of modern science? Are the suggestions of Jesus and Paul regarding life after physical death similar in any respects to the communications claimed to be received in recent days from those who have died? Cf., Lodge, *Raymond*; Cameron, *Seven Purposes*; King, *The Abolishing of Death*; Hyslop, *Contact with the Other World*. How probable is it that scientific research will in the future throw light on the life beyond death? Are the leaders in the modern revival of interest in the other life theologians or scientists, and what is the significance of that fact?

#### *Subjects for Further Study.*

- (1) Trace the growth of the belief in God's fatherhood in the Old Testament.
- (2) In what respects is the modern Juvenile Court a long advance toward Jesus' way of saving the lost? (Flexner, *The Juvenile Court*; Elliott, *The Juvenile Court*.)
- (3) What is the derivation and meaning of the English word worship? Define your own conception of worship.
- (4) What are the modern scientific theories regarding the psychology of prayer? (Strong, *The Psychology of Prayer*; Fosdick, *The Meaning of Prayer*.)
- (5) What is the Christian Science theory of prayer as used in healing the sick?
- (6) Compare Plato's teaching regarding personal immortality with that of Jesus.
- (7) What are the modern scientific theories regarding ether and matter? (Sir Joseph John Thomson, *Corpuscular Theory of Matter*; Lodge, *Matter and Ether*, in *Hibbert Journal*, January, 1919.)

## CHAPTER IV.

## TRUTHFULNESS AND SINCERITY.

*Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*, pp. 198-211.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 107-134.

Follett, *The New State*, pp. 93-133.

I have spoken not on my own authority, but the Father who sent me has commanded me what to say and what to speak, and I know that his command means eternal life. Therefore whatever I speak, I speak as the Father has bidden me. *John 12: 49, 50.*

Earth and sky will pass away but my words will not pass away. But no man knows the day or hour, not even the angels in heaven nor the Son, but only the Father. *Mark 13: 31, 32.*

He who has seen me has seen the Father; then how can you say, "Let us see the Father"? Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me? The words that I speak to you I speak not on my own authority, but the Father who is always in me does his own work. Believe me, I am in the Father and the Father in me, or else believe me because of the work itself. *John 14: 9-11.*

You have heard that it has been said, "You shall not commit adultery." But I tell you, one who looks with impure intention at a woman has already committed adultery with her in his heart. *Matt. 5: 27, 28.*

You have heard how the men of old were told, "You must not swear falsely, but what you have vowed to the Lord, you shall pay." But I tell you, Swear not at all, neither by heaven, for it is the throne of God, nor by earth, for it is the footstool under his feet, nor by Jerusalem, for it is the city of the great King. Do not swear by your head, of which you cannot make a single hair white or black. Let your affirmation be simply, "Yes" and your denial, "No." Anything beyond that is of evil origin. *Matt. 5: 33-37.*

Take care that you do not perform your good deeds before men in order to be seen by them; otherwise you receive no reward from your Father in heaven. *Matt. 6: 1.* (*Shorter Bible* translation.)

## I.

## JESUS' FRANK RECOGNITION OF HIS OWN LIMITATIONS AND SUPERIORITY.

Jesus' own appreciation of the significance of his life and teachings to humanity is found in his frequent injunction, "Follow me." He clearly intended that human beings should attempt to apply his teachings practically in everyday life and to get the spirit of those teachings from his own personal life and life work. So much emphasis has been laid at times on the divinity of Jesus that people knowing their own weaknesses

have felt it impossible to follow him, and in consequence have failed to make the effort. They have assumed that Jesus was in all respects infinite in power, knowledge, and wisdom. Jesus, however, clearly felt and taught that it is possible for human beings by proper effort to attain so much of the divine spirit that they can effectively follow him. On the other hand, he himself called attention repeatedly to his own limitations. But speaking from the human point of view, he showed that it was possible for him as a man to interpret the spirit of God, to understand God's will and to follow it. Although he knew how imperfect were the most developed of his disciples, he believed that it was possible for other men, like himself, to understand and follow God's will. "Be perfect even as your Father in heaven is perfect" is one of his ringing injunctions. "Greater deeds shall you do than I have done" has too often been ignored or minimized.

In speaking with the young ruler, who had come to him as one who was perfect, he disclaimed perfection saying, "Why do you call me good? No one is good except one only, God." Jesus here reveals an earnest desire to obliterate the distinction that even then his followers were beginning to make between his personality and possibilities and those of the other sons of men. In all that he says and does the teaching aim is dominant. At every point there is also a careful adaptation of his methods to the needs of the people with whom he is dealing. As has already been noted, in accordance with the ordinary principles of good judgment that would be followed by any sensible man in planning a great campaign for social work, he first selects Capernaum as the chief place of his activities, with the definite hope of transferring that work later to Jerusalem. We also recognize a very human feeling of disappointment at the apparent slowness with which the Jews and the other residents of Capernaum and Jerusalem accepted his teachings, and the sorrow in his heart when he realized the inevitable fate that would overtake these cities because they had rejected the great opportunity offered them.

And yet with these limitations to his control over the freedom of human beings, we find no sign of doubt in the absolute truth of his teachings and in the certainty of their ultimate triumph. So great was this confidence that he left no word written by his own hand. He always spoke with

absolute positiveness. He knew that he was interpreting God's spirit. Others recognized the fact that he felt himself to be the interpreter of God to men. "He spoke as one having authority and not as the scribes."

In his interpretation of the ancient law he did not quibble over minor technicalities; but instead he sought for the real spirit of the teachings and placed his own interpretation on the meaning of the law with the same boldness and positiveness as did the great prophets of old. On many occasions, especially toward the close of his ministry, he even went further than that and claimed his intimate sonship or unity with God. "I am the way, the truth, and the life. No man comes to the Father except through me. The words I speak to you I speak on my own authority, and the Father who is always in me does the work. Believe me, I am in the Father and he is in me, or else believe me because of the work itself." Likewise when he stood before the high priests and they questioned him, "Are you the Messiah? Tell us if you are. Are you then the Son of God?" He replied, "It is as you say, I am." But with this assumption of divinity he in no way separated himself from humanity, but claimed all men as brothers. He implied that they also are sons of God, for any man who has attained so much of the divine spirit that his life has been transformed demonstrates thereby his kinship with God.

What evidence do you find in the New Testament that Jesus modified the plan of his life work after the beginning of his ministry? How far is such modification a proof of human wisdom? Why is it not evidence of a lack of divine inspiration?

## II.

### THE FUNDAMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE OF MOTIVES.

It is a commonplace of the law that the essence of crime lies in the intent. A man may kill another by accident. No crime has been committed. There was no wrong intent. A man committing a felony may kill another with no intent to kill, but as an unexpected accompaniment of the serious crime. He has committed manslaughter, but not murder. This fundamental fact in law Jesus makes of prime significance in

all the acts of everyday life. No other great teacher has recognized so fully the fact that a man's acts are determined and should be judged by motives. Whatever the question under discussion, we see Jesus with a marvellous keenness of insight searching always for the underlying motives of action. In his interpretation of the ancient law the same spirit is continually found. What was the purpose of the law? Why was the law so framed? On this underlying reason he bases his interpretation of each law.

Is the question one of Sabbath keeping; he at once asks, What is the purpose of the Sabbath? He finds that "the Sabbath was made for man," and that fact is the key to his interpretation of the law. It is therefore lawful to do good on the Sabbath day. Is the question one of sexual relations; he tells you that "one who looks with impure intention at a woman has already committed adultery with her in his heart." Is the question one of prayer; it is not the Pharisee's long prayers that count but the humble tax-gatherer's lowly spirit of petition when beating on his breast he cries, "O God, have mercy on me, a sinner." Is the question one of charity; it is not the ostentatious gift of the rich man but the genuine sacrifice of the poor widow who gives her last two mites that is acceptable in the sight of God. This keenness of insight for the heart of questions, this search for the underlying motives was so eminently characteristic of him in distinction from all other teachers, that he has been rightly characterized as the Spirit of Truth.

The real significance of this in its application to our everyday life is often not realized so fully as it should be; and yet, especially in these later days, in the establishment of our children's courts and in the frequent practice of suspension of sentence in case of crimes committed, where the evil intention is not clearly apparent, we see the reflection of this spirit of Jesus. It would be difficult to-day for any judge to impose a heavy sentence upon a mother who stole with the evident purpose of feeding a suffering child. Children whose misdemeanors are committed primarily with no serious intent to injure others, but in a mere spirit of mischief or perhaps through ignorance, are taught their lesson by showing them the social wrong actually done and by giving them a warning for the future and a suspension of sentence for the time being.

It is important for us to keep clearly in mind in our judgment of others this sharp line of distinction between crime and sin. Crime is a violation of man's law, the law of the state. Sin is a violation of God's law; that is, the physical, mental and moral law inherent in nature, which may or may not be embodied in human law. Man's law also considers motive and intent but often judges the motive simply by the act. God's law invariably is interpreted by the conscience of the doer, who has sought out and judged the facts antecedent to his act. Hence guilt is absolutely dependent upon the motive. In order that society may be protected, it may well be that people who have wronged society, but with no evil intent, must be restrained or even punished. In our judgment of others it is imperative that we always keep clearly in mind the fundamental significance of the motives that inspire their acts.

What in your judgment is the criterion of good and evil? What determines the right or wrong of any specific act? Under what circumstances may a man do evil without sin and sin in doing good?

### III.

#### SIMPLICITY AND DIRECTNESS.

Jesus' teaching regarding directness and sincerity in speech is even more emphatic than that of the ancient law on the question of swearing. The ancient law decreed, "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain; thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor." Clearly the idea of the Hebrew code was to prevent a violation of the spirit of reverence toward Jehovah on the one hand and on the other to prevent the evil that is done to society whenever any one bears false witness in the settlement of controversies. Jesus' teaching was more fundamental. All kinds of oaths were condemned. "Let your affirmation be simply, 'Yes,' your denial simply, 'No'; anything beyond that is of evil origin."

We are altogether too careless regarding the common exaggeration and false implications of our speech. Frequently, by the exaggerated use of strong adjectives or adverbs, false impressions are given. Newspaper articles are written which,

though containing no absolutely false statements, may yet through the suggestion of evil motives by the use of adjectives and adverbs give a completely inaccurate impression. It would be difficult to prove anything wrong in the statement of facts. The article itself would not sustain an action for libel, and yet the insinuations regarding some man's character may be such that his reputation will be ruined.

Of equal importance is the necessity of a good command of language if one is to make the best impression upon an audience or upon refined people. A harsh tone and the use of slang, not to speak of oaths, however picturesque they may be, always make a bad impression when serious business is under way. The habit breeds carelessness about accuracy in the meaning of words and prevents the growth of one's vocabulary. Wendell Phillips, the great orator of the last generation, from boyhood up forbade himself the use of slang for that express reason, and the result showed his wisdom.

Another evil which is condemned in this statement of Jesus is the lack of discrimination and thus of power to tell the exact truth. The frequent use of vivid words such as are often employed in slang and in the common oaths of the untrained and uneducated develop this evil. A person who characterizes almost every act or thought by some common slang of the day soon finds himself so impoverished in speech that he cannot express with accuracy different shades of meaning. This is perhaps the chief evil of the frequent use of slang and possibly even the chief evil of common swearing. Very frequently the ignorant, profane man has no seriously evil intent, but lacking a proper vocabulary, he uses oaths to express a great variety of meanings. Besides vulgarity or sin in speech, he lacks accuracy in statement and discriminating force; and this, as Jesus so clearly implies, is evil in its effect upon him and upon society. It shows sheer vulgar stupidity.

What is a lie? When is a lie justifiable? What reasons are there for thinking that a lie is the greatest wrong against society? Under what circumstances is a lie socially worse than murder? How many really great men have the habit of swearing? Or lying? In what ways, if any, are a loud voice and oaths a help or a hindrance in enforcing discipline? Why?

## IV.

## INTEGRITY IN BUSINESS.

Accuracy is absolutely essential in ordinary business life. Lack of discrimination in speech frequently breeds lack of discrimination in thought. From mere slovenliness of thought men do not see clearly the condition of their own business. Probably no less than seventy-five per cent of all failures are due to the fact that the business man, through carelessness in account keeping, does not really understand the condition of his business until it is too late. One of the greatest improvements in the science of business is the growth of the practice of cost accountancy, which enables a man to know exactly what the various processes cost him, and in that way he is able at any moment to determine his standing.

Honesty in business, accuracy of statement in advertising, and absolute trustworthiness have raised the quality of the product that the business man manufactures. Honest sales give a reputation that leads far toward success. In practically every country where there are numerous dealers, some one firm will be found to stand out for absolute trustworthiness. Others will attempt to palm off unsalable or imperfect goods on customers whom they have secured by advertising special bargains. In the long run the trustworthy merchant is the one who succeeds. In the end sharp practice never pays. Of late years the value of the good will in business that is built up by trustworthy practice has become of great importance in law and in financing. A change in the spirit of the management of a business which forfeits its reputation for sincerity and honorable dealing often causes serious loss. Of almost equal importance is the increasing recognition in law and business of the actual value of certain brands of goods, of which the reputation has been established by the absolute maintenance of quality.

Certain makes of watches are standard, each in its place. Certain brands of silver or tea or breakfast foods or soaps are well known the world over, and people are often ready to pay a little higher price in order to be absolutely certain of the quality of the goods purchased. This is a very practical recognition of the value of truth and sincerity in every branch of life and shows the great business value of this simple Christian teaching.

Why would you not trust a man who is honest simply because honesty is the best business policy? What are the disadvantages as well as the advantages of our pure food laws? How far can people be made good or honest by legislation?

## V.

## HONESTY IN POLITICS.

Much has been said of late years of the evils of the boss system in politics. It is an interesting fact, nevertheless, that no one of the political leaders who have attained real power has been long successful unless he has kept faith, at any rate with his followers. It may well be that his policies have been injurious or misleading to the opposite party or to the public at large, but with his followers he must keep his word or failure is sure and usually swift.

There can be no doubt that even a great statesman like Bismarck, who did not hesitate to deceive foreign nations, was faithful to his king. Even brutality does not make political enemies more surely than does treachery and falsehood.

No one doubts the ability of Benedict Arnold. Some writers even uphold his motives; but the stigmas of treachery and treason ruined his life and have blasted his reputation for all time.

Without the confidence of the public, no government can persist if it interferes seriously with the life of the common people. The characteristics that have been most frequently cited as typical of the greatness of Washington and of Lincoln are their complete trustworthiness and their soundness of judgment which came from their seeing with absolute accuracy into the motives of not only their followers but also of their enemies. These are simply illustrations in the field of public activity of the advantage of absolute truth and explain the emphasis upon the significance of motives which underlies the teachings of Jesus.

Whenever dishonorable business customs are widely spread in any country, the government usually is affected thereby, and the financial credit as well as the political reputation of the nation suffers. The thriftlessness and lack of faith and trustworthiness in financial matters of the Government of Egypt were the chief causes of its loss by the Turkish Empire

and its dominance by the British. The condition of Mexico is largely due to the same cause. Neither do the politicians trust one another nor can they win the confidence of foreigners on account of their treachery.

How vital therefore becomes the accuracy of the press in statements of fact and opinion in a free country! Many of the extreme views held by citizens are due to the fact that they are misinformed by their newspapers regarding the motives and the acts of their fellow citizens and of the government. One of the great evils of many foreign governments has been the subsidizing of the press so as to convey wrong impressions and lying information to the people. It is a common device of autocratic governments. It has been at times also a device of unpatriotic partisans or self-seeking propagandists in free countries. Every government and every citizen should be scrupulous regarding the accuracy of information given to the public.

Name nations that have acquired a world reputation for honesty in international dealings. Give illustrations of either governments or people that have been considered untrustworthy. What are the evil effects, both economic and political, of such a reputation? What practical measures should be taken by governments and private citizens to give accurate information to the public? What kinds of propaganda are justifiable and beneficial?

## VI.

### SINCERITY IN THE RELIGIOUS LIFE.

It has been frequently assumed that from its nature religion must be true and sincere. In many instances, nevertheless, mainly through carelessness in practice and slovenliness in methods of thought and act, the religious spirit and vision are dimmed. A wise preacher of thirty years ago when asked to name the chief drawback to the calling of the ministry replied, "The difficulty of keeping with absolute sincerity the spirit of reverence for religious things." He added that when one's business was to speak continually about religious things, they were likely to become commonplace. In consequence, a preacher himself was conscious at times of placing an emphasis upon his words that was beyond his real feeling, in order that

he might arouse within his hearers religious emotions that were keener than his own. A preacher is therefore continually tempted to indulge in an exaggeration which is almost hypocrisy.

Few persons who are not careful students of human nature will have thought of this danger in the religious life, and yet there is a reality in the danger that men should heed. How often for example in prayer meetings and in the prayers and talks of laymen, as well as preachers, do we hear used the words of the psalmist or of the great religious prophets in relations which make it evident that those words are merely carelessly used quotations instead of an expression of real feeling. Doubtless the ancient poets with their imaginative natures and under the stress of the great evils or the great joys in which they were living actually felt as their words express, but when we with commonplace minds on an ordinary occasion quote those expressions as representative of our feelings, a moment's thought will show that those words are false. Usually the intent is not to deceive. Usually it is merely poverty of thought and language which leads us to routine use of these expressions. Are we not training ourselves in habits of inaccuracy? Are we not dulling what should be our vivid feelings of sincere religious desires into mere routine by thus using words that are quite different from Jesus' simple, direct "Yes" and "No"? Is not this the essence of what is popularly characterized as "cant"?

We need to recognize that in the worship of God we may well distinguish between the emotional and the intellectual forms of worship and worship expressed in service. Doubtless among the more ignorant, too great stress has been laid upon emotional expression. It has often been sincerely believed and taught that in worship the emotions were in themselves the essential thing. Again, by some of our great religious teachers, especially those of two or three generations ago, too much emphasis was placed upon mere intellectual belief and upon the finely spun reasoning over the logical meanings of certain passages of scripture. Both the emotions and the reason have their places — and important places — in our religious life, but after all Jesus in his teachings dwells mainly upon service to humanity. This service consists chiefly in acts of sincerity in connection with our daily tasks. If the spirit of truth lives in our words and in our daily work, it will usually be found that therein we are rendering our best service to

others. No one should underestimate the value of service rendered professionally in the forms of either individual teaching or public preaching; but it is nevertheless true that the larger part of our lives must be practically given to earning our living in association with our families and with the people with whom we come in contact in our daily occupations. If the Christian spirit of truth, sincerity, and helpfulness shines through all our dealings with others, they also will be inspired with the spirit of Jesus.

What measures can be taken to obviate the danger that the practice of family worship may degenerate into mere routine, so that the effect will be to deaden the true religious spirit?

For what reason is the popular reaction against cant wholesome? How can we avoid cant? How great is the danger to-day that in our fear of cant, we will refrain from the open expression of our deepest religious feelings?

*Subjects for Further Study.*

(1) The influence of motive on individual behavior in the light of modern psychology. (James, *Psychology*; Bagley, *Behavior*.)

(2) What are the psychological causes of profanity? (Patrick, *The Psychology of Relaxation*, pp. 145-171.) What are the chief reasons why swearing is harmful?

(3) Trace the growth of the movement toward absolute truthfulness and sincerity in business advertising. Cf. the work of the Association of Advertising Clubs and Rotary Clubs.

(4) Study the controversy between President Wilson and the United States Senate over the League of Nations. Avoid partisan sources and study both sides critically. Note how widely people equally sincere may differ in judgment on policies. Put your conclusions in writing.

(5) What are the advantages and the disadvantages of the ritualistic types of worship? What are the advantages and disadvantages of the non-ritualistic types of worship?

---

## CHAPTER V.

### PERSONAL RESPONSIBILITY.

*Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *Historical Bible*, pp. 176-188.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 135-176.

Follett, *The New State*, pp. 137-161.

Why look critically at the speck in your brother's eye and fail to see the splinter in your own? Can you say to your brother, "Let me take the speck out of your eye," while there is a splinter in your own? You hypocrite, first take the splinter out of your own eye; then you will see clearly how to remove the speck from your brother's eye. *Matt. 7: 3-5.*

It is inevitable that temptation should come, but woe to the man through whom it comes! It would be better for him to be flung into the sea with a millstone about his neck than that he cause one of these little ones to fall! *Luke 17: 1, 2.*

Give to him who asks of you, and turn away from no one who wishes to borrow from you.

You have heard the saying, "You shall love your neighbor and hate your enemy." But I say to you, love your enemies, bless those who curse you, do good to those who hate you, and pray for those who persecute you, that you may become sons of your Father in heaven; for he causes his sun to rise on the bad and good alike, and sends rain on both those who do right and those who do wrong. For if you love only those who love you, what reward have you earned? Do not even the tax-gatherers as much? And if you show courtesy only to your friends, what more are you doing than others? Do not even the heathen as much? You must therefore become perfect, even as your heavenly Father is perfect. *Matt. 5: 42-48.*

Therefore, whatsoever you wish that men should do to you, do even so to them; this is the summing up of the law and the prophets. *Matt. 7:12.* (*Shorter Bible translation.*)

## I.

### THE INFINITE WORTH OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

The world war has brought into common use the word democracy, and men are seeking to apply democratic principles to every phase of human life. In a political sense President Wilson declared that the chief aim of the Great War was to make the world safe for democracy. In the business field we are hearing much from different types of reformers of an industrial democracy.

In all these applications of the word there is the common thought that the people, "just folks," are to be seriously considered and that they should have an active part themselves in determining their own rights and in directing their own affairs.

The fundamental principle in Jesus' plan for a social democracy is that each individual is of infinite worth and that society should provide for his fullest and highest development.

Jesus taught that the consciousness on the part of the individual of his own worth and personal responsibility springs from the thought that God himself recognizes the value of the individual. "As for you, the very hairs of your head are numbered." "Consider the lilies of the field, how they grow; they toil not, neither do they spin; yet I say to you, that even Solomon in all his glory was not clothed like one of these. But if God so clothes the grass of the field, which exists to-day and to-morrow is cast into the oven, shall he not much more clothe you, O you of little faith?" To his humble, uneducated disciples Jesus declared: "You are the salt of the earth. You are the light of the world." Throughout his entire teachings he makes it clear that in the sight of God each man's worth lies within himself and is not at all dependent upon worldly rank or power. It is not even dependent upon intellectual strength or wisdom, but rather upon his essential manhood and upon his moral uprightness and devotion to the noblest social ideals.

Jesus saw the potential worth of each individual. Levi, the grafting tax-gatherer, and the pitiable women of the streets were, as he found them, of little value to themselves or to society. In fact they were doubtless doing more harm than good; but Jesus gave them a vision of what they might be and do, and then taught them how to demonstrate their worth. Measured thus by the standards of potential worth, each son or daughter of man, however physically, mentally or morally degraded he may be, is potentially a princely son or daughter of God and therefore is regarded and treated by Jesus with the noblest consideration. This attitude toward all mankind is the corner stone of any true democracy. It is the conviction of this which gave birth to democracy and underlies all democratic effort. The welfare, happiness and social opportunity of the individual is the final object of democratic organization.

What are the dangers and what are the benefits of the individual's recognition of the worth of his soul in the sight of God? What more is needed to form a democracy of a high type than individuals of a high type? What do you understand by the expressions "social mind" and "community purpose" in their relation to the thought and action of individuals?

## II.

## THE RESPONSIBILITY OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

If the individual has worth, people will expect him to assume the responsibility for all his acts. With value naturally goes responsibility. Jesus himself followed this principle which he had been the first to recognize for all men. Nowhere in his teachings do we find any intimation that he himself would evade the responsibility of any of his acts or of his teachings by following blindly the judgment or the doctrines of any teacher of his own time or the teachings of the ancient Law or the Prophets. On the contrary, carefully as he had studied their teachings, he always assumed the responsibility of thinking them through and interpreting them in the light of his own experience and reason.

The people of his own day recognized the difference in this respect between his work and that of other teachers. "He taught as one having authority and not as the scribes." He himself was in the habit of saying, "It has been said of old time," and then following his quotation with the words, "But I say to you." By such a method he did not attempt to undermine the authority of the ancient teachings, but rather to emphasize the fact that true as those teachings are, they must be interpreted in the light of the new conditions of his day and that it is not wise nor right for any individual to follow blindly the teachings of another. He must make his own decisions in the light of his own experience. Jesus said, "I came not to destroy but to fulfill," but the law cannot be intelligently or truly fulfilled except by interpreting it and applying it to contemporary conditions. "For the letter kills, but the spirit gives life." It is in the spirit of the law that its truth consists.

Jesus nowhere intimates that any of his disciples can evade personal responsibility for their acts. He nowhere suggests that they should thoughtlessly rely upon the teachings of the priests or of other leaders or even on himself. When they follow him they must also accept his principles and assume personal responsibility. He left few or no specific teachings about the details of great social problems such as slavery, temperance, and industrial organizations. They must, of course, be worked out in the light of conditions existing at the time, and individuals must take the responsibility of dealing with them as they arise.

What is the moral effect of forcing a man against his will to obey rules or laws that he dislikes and in which he does not believe? How would such forced action eventually affect his acts and his character?

Give some illustrations of acts that are morally right in one country but morally wrong in another country. Can you state any conditions under which a private citizen should take the responsibility of interpreting a law of his country contrary to the decisions of the higher courts?

### III.

#### INDEPENDENCE OF JUDGMENT.

Independence of judgment is a necessity if man is to assume responsibility. On all the insistent problems of his day Jesus formed his own definite opinions, and when asked, frankly stated them, even though his statement aroused the bitter antagonism of the religious leaders of Judaism. He believed that Rome had performed a real service to the world and plainly said that the peoples who had profited by it should make a corresponding return, even though to pay tribute to Rome was regarded as treason by the majority of the Jews of the day. In the same way, by act as well as by word, he revealed his own independent judgment regarding the significance of the Sabbath, although it aroused the hot indignation of the Pharisees (cf. p. 82, 84). He also took direct issue with the orthodox Jewish doctrine regarding the life of the individual after death (cf. p. 35). Thus before his followers he set the example of independent judgment on all religious as well as secular questions. He also refused to subject his disciples to the onerous and meaningless ceremonial laws upon which the Pharisees strenuously insisted (Mark 7: 1-16).

More than that, Jesus repeatedly encouraged and even compelled his disciples to form independent judgments. During the last period of retirement with them, he first asked them what men thought about him; then he put the momentous question to them directly: A Who do you think that I am? All their previous training had been to prepare them for this crisis, and when Peter's reply Dindict 132 75 indicated that he was capable of

36 75

K413J

forming a judgment independent of the orthodox religious leaders of his day, the Master's enthusiasm was unbounded.

In all his endeavors to save man and to develop perfect manhood Jesus did not aim, as did the other teachers of his day, to lay down detailed laws which they were blindly to obey, but he tried to lead them to perceive and accept certain broad principles which they could apply to each specific question that arose. Even obedience to Jesus' commands calls for independent judgment of the highest order. "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free" reveals Jesus' method as a teacher. Whenever his followers in later ages have abandoned his method and emphasized not the spirit but the letter that kills, not only the church but the individual has suffered. To all his disciples Jesus first said, "Follow me"; then "Go."

Give other illustrations of Jesus' independence of judgment; of his effort to develop independent judgment on the part of his disciples. By what tests can you distinguish independence of judgment from obstinacy or narrow-mindedness? What is the difference between independent judgment and dogmatism?

#### IV. TOLERANCE.

If an individual demands independence of judgment for himself, and assumes the responsibility for his acts, he must of course grant that same independence of judgment to others even though their judgment, as will frequently happen, differs from his own. To be consistent he must be tolerant of others.

This toleration is another of the fundamental principles of democracy. Only those who can recognize, without bitterness of feeling and without a desire to coerce others, their differences in judgment, are fully qualified to be citizens in a real democracy. The spirit of tolerance is necessary for the satisfactory working out of the rule of the majority.

This spirit of tolerance Jesus likewise exhibited in a marked degree. There was no lack of clearness or of vigor in his own decisions. There is no lack of clearness in the conditions which he lays down for those who would become his followers, but in

stating those conditions he is simply building upon psychological and social facts. He is stating psychological, mental, and moral laws which actually work in society. Those rules enforce themselves through the processes of nature's laws. No coercion, physical or mental, can affect their action, and Jesus makes no effort to coerce. Nowhere in his teachings do we find any instances of any desire to coerce or of any feeling of hostility toward others on account of differences of opinion.

Vigorous in denunciation he is at times. Perhaps nowhere in literature can we find a more striking example of scathing denunciation than in his onslaught upon the scribes and Pharisees. "Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! You shut in men's faces the door to the rule of Heaven; for you neither enter yourselves nor let those enter who wish to come in. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you scour sea and land to gain a single convert, and when you succeed, you make him twice as great a son of hell as yourselves. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you pay to the temple the tenth part of the produce of your mint, anise, and cummin, and have neglected the weightier requirements of the law: justice, mercy, fidelity. Blind guides, who strain out the gnat and swallow the camel! Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you make clean the outside of the cup and the plate, and then fill them with your extortion and self-indulgence. Blind Pharisee! first make clean the inside of the cup, that the outside as well may become clean. Woe to you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! For you are like whitewashed tombs, beautiful without, but within full of dead men's bones and utter filth. So you yourselves appear upright, and within are filled with hypocrisy and sin." (Matt. 23: 13-15, 23-28; *Shorter Bible translation.*)

These denunciations are not because of differences of opinion but because of the hypocrisy, treachery and selfishness of the men to whom they are addressed. Even when he goes beyond mere denunciation and utters words of scorn and contempt that must have stung worse than the blows of the whip with which he drove the desecrators of his Father's house from the temple, he is not intolerant of differences of opinion. He is condemning actual violators of the law and grasping usurers. Consider on the other hand the readiness with which he discusses frankly and directly questions of religion with Simon the

Zealot or Levi the tax-collector. The way in which he sums up the commandments into his new commandment, "You shall love your neighbor as yourself," shows the greatest breadth of view in individual interpretation of the law, so long as the spirit of the individual is right and his attitude toward others unselfish. Keeping fully in mind the customs of his day, note also his attitude toward the woman taken in adultery. His attitude toward her accusers, who, he strongly intimates, are probably hypocrites and insincere, is most condemnatory; but toward the woman, whom he doubtless believes repentant and sincere, he is tolerant. "Did no man condemn you?" "No man, Lord." "Neither do I condemn you; go your way; henceforth sin no more." So long as the present purpose is pure and right, no former act, however contrary to one's own views, merits the bitterness of condemnation, even though it must be disapproved for the sake of others and of society.

Even when he heard that another was casting out demons by the use of his name, he showed no sign of jealousy but welcomed the good deed, saying that if one did a good deed in his name he would not be able quickly to speak evil regarding him. The great Teacher was modest, thoughtful, tolerant in all his ways, and apparently, like Socrates, ready to discuss his views with others. As a teaching principle, the freedom of discussion is essential to the best work. People grow intellectually not so much by the passive acceptance of truths given them as by the creative thinking out of principles and decisions from facts and ideas laid before them in discussion or through questions.

When in a discussion of a political question with a group of men as well informed on such questions as yourself, you find yourself in the minority, why do you not accept the judgment of the majority and admit that you are wrong? Why ought you carefully to review your grounds of judgment before denouncing your opponents? Why did Jesus not admit himself in the wrong when he found himself alone against a city full of opponents?

Why is success in changing the views of many opponents not a sufficient proof of the soundness of a man's judgment on a controversial question? How can one be sure of one's judgment? What is the safe test?

## V.

## THE NECESSITY OF PREPARATION FOR RESPONSIBILITY.

If a man is to think and judge independently and bear his own responsibility, he must not make hasty judgments. This is essential both for his own sake and for that of others whom his acts affect. In any society, especially if the form of government is democratic, the persons upon whom rests the responsibility of guiding the affairs of others should make careful preparation and know the probable consequences of their acts. We need better trained legislators and executives and even judges.

Jesus recognized this principle far more than is ordinarily thought. Too often we have assumed that Jesus was so imbued in some miraculous way with the spirit of God that he had no need of preparation for his life work. The records, however, teach quite the contrary. We know from the account given of his discussion with the elders in the temple when he was twelve years of age, that even as a child he possessed a maturity of knowledge and of judgment that deeply impressed even the wisest men of his day; yet in spite of this remarkable intellectual capacity, or perhaps because of this unusual maturity, Jesus himself did not venture to undertake public teaching or to appear as a leader of the people until he had spent fully twenty years in work and study.

The exact nature of his preparation we do not know, but it is evident that he studied thoroughly the Law and the Prophets. He had probably the advantages of listening to the teaching of Hillel, the wisest of the progressive commentators of his day. He had worked as a carpenter, and in all likelihood as master carpenter he had been an employer of labor. Through these various associations he normally acquired a thorough knowledge of human nature, and from the records of his life and his teachings we see how profound his knowledge had become.

In the account given of the temptations, we get the best hint of his habit of self-analysis in connection with his preparation for his own life work. Evidently in determining his life plans he had to face and reject the normal, urgent temptations of all strong men to devote himself to acquiring wealth, to the pursuit of fame and popularity, and especially the strong

temptation to dominate other people and become a political leader, as many of his followers later desired and urged. It is evident that he might easily have attained a prominent, if not even a dominant position in any one of these directions had he determined so to shape his life. It is, however, also evident that, with his power of analyzing human nature and social conditions, he saw clearly that the attainment of any one of these ends would be absolutely fatal to the success of his real life work, that of putting into active working effect in society his few but profound principles of living, which would in the process of time so regenerate individuals that there would be brought about a reorganized society of such a type that it might well be called the Rule of God.

If Jesus had been a man of great wealth, how would he have been handicapped in his work of regeneration? What were his reasons for urging those cured by him to tell no one about it?

If he had become a powerful king ruling Palestine or even the Roman Empire, how would that position have affected the establishment of his moral and spiritual leadership of humanity?

## VI.

### PRACTICAL APPLICATION OF THE GOLDEN RULE.

Jesus summed up the practical social application of his principles of living in the Golden Rule. "Whatever you wish that men should do to you, do even so to them." The law of love, in its negative form at least, had been formulated by many different social religious teachers. Confucius, for example, had summed it up in "Do not unto others that which you do not wish them to do to you," and the same idea is found likewise in the teachings of the greater prophets. Buddha in his teachings had laid great emphasis upon the principle of service. Even at the present time in Burma and other countries where Buddhism flourishes, we often see bridges, temples, and gifts of various kinds presented to the public in order that the giver, to use the Buddhistic expression, "may acquire merit."

Jesus then, in the enunciation of the law of love, simply made more positive, more emphatic the same doctrine that

others in other lands had promulgated even earlier than he. Though it is probable that the greatest single contribution to social and political philosophy that Jesus made is found, as has been indicated, in the principle of personal responsibility, yet we should not forget that that principle loses its chief social significance unless the individual is inspired by the spirit of service. There must be co-operation among men in all the relations of life, if the best results are to be attained.

Is this rule of love practical? How is it applicable in everyday affairs? Until within the last few years many business men were in the habit of saying that this rule, while idealistically beautiful, could not be employed in business. Many statesmen at the present day think that it is not applicable in governmental affairs, especially in international dealings. There is, however, at present a large and rapidly growing group of both publicists and business men who believe that this rule is not only applicable, but is the only sound principle to apply in both public and private life. Doubtless an individual will at times lose in material things, for a short period at least, by attempting to live up strictly to this principle of devotion to the welfare of others, and yet in the end, as has been noted, it is applicable in both politics and business.

A few years ago, the conscientious mayor of Toledo, because he attempted to apply this principle in his administration of the city's business, was called "Golden Rule Jones." Some of the leading business men considered him unpractical, even fanatical, but most believed him honest and sincere and the majority thought his administration good and sound. Its influence on the city government has been felt ever since.

In business, too, it is rapidly becoming axiomatic that service to clients and customers is essential to success. "The customer is always right" is considered a sound business principle, even though often abused by the customer. Practically all of our great business houses have adopted it.

Even more striking perhaps is the attempt, especially since the experiences of the World War, to work out this spirit by co-operation in industry, particularly between workmen and employers. This spirit is a necessary corollary to the principle of individual responsibility if the best results are to be attained in any field. Each man while bearing his responsibility should devote his work and himself to the welfare of

the community. In industry, when this spirit obtains, workmen and employers work together in harmony and it is easy and normal for the workmen to share in the responsibilities of management in matters that affect them and their work.

This co-operation — working together — differs, of course, in form from that industrial co-operation in which the workmen furnish also the capital.

Too often, especially in bygone days, Christian teachers have placed an overemphasis upon charity in the sense of gifts to beggars, whom they have assumed to be needy. While Jesus sought to inspire a spirit of kindness and helpfulness, we have no reason to think that he encouraged indiscriminate giving. He knew the need of those whom he healed and otherwise blessed. Throughout his life and throughout his teachings there runs a spirit of sanity and of good judgment which would forbid any act that would encourage fraud. Moreover, the great emphasis that he does place upon giving applies rather to the effect upon the giver than upon the recipient. It is the spirit of love for one's fellow men that he stresses.

In all things, therefore, in the duty and the happiness that we should have in promoting the welfare of others, we should not forget that the responsibility rests upon us to employ our property and ourselves in whatever way will serve best the interests of the community. And the responsibility rests upon us to make a careful study of the situation so that our services may not be rendered amiss. This imposes upon every one then the duty of studying his own capacities, his own resources, and the ways in which he can best serve others. Some may work best in giving, others in teaching or preaching, others in managing a business in a keen but conscientious way, others in maintaining order in the community as police or in upholding the cause of justice and righteousness by bearing arms in warfare. The question is of the reality of the service rather than of its form, and the individual can no more escape the responsibility of selecting the type of service which he can best render than he can escape the responsibility of guiding his personal life in other ways. Often for fear that he may be charged with self-seeking, a strong man hesitates to run for a political office or to push himself into a position of prominence; but leadership is one of the rare gifts and one should not shirk the responsibility of leadership whether the opportunity is due to natural

qualities, to wealth, social prestige or other causes, any more than he should hesitate to assume less prominent responsibilities.

Why is a conscious recognition of one's own powers, even if they be superior to those of most other men, compatible with humility? Name as many great men as possible — scientists, business men, statesmen — who are boastful in manner and spirit. Name others who are modest. How often is a man whose eyes are open to opportunities for service likely to see social tasks confronting him that are beyond his power to complete? Distinguish the spirit of independence in judgment from that of vain self-sufficiency. Show the way in which the principle of individual responsibility can be successfully applied throughout a large business from the superintendent through all the grades of workmen to the lowest.

*Subjects for Further Study.*

- (1) Cite passages in the New Testament which support the thesis that Jesus held each man responsible in the sight of God for all his acts.
- (2) Compare Jesus' attitude and that of the ordinary police official toward the women of the street.
- (3) Cite New Testament passages giving Jesus' conception of the dignity and possibilities of men.
- (4) Give some example of industrial co-operation in which the capital is owned by the workmen.
- (5) The dean of a Southern college recently remarked, "I have found men who are bigoted almost universally morally unreliable. When they are present, I always look out for my pocket-book, whether they be students or clergymen. I am inclined to think that the reason is that this class substitute orthodoxy for religion." How far are his conclusions correct?
- (6) What are the teachings of modern psychology regarding the relations of men's motives and their acts? Compare these teachings with those of Jesus. Cf. *Psychologies of James, Dewey, Angell*.
- (7) Work out a plan by which a contractor who is building a house can place responsibility upon each of his workmen: masons, carpenters, painters, plumbers, and unskilled workmen, without relaxing discipline or disorganizing his working force. If possible, provide for paying each in proportion to the service rendered.
- (8) Compare the views of Jesus regarding resistance to the evils of society with those of Presidents Washington, Lincoln, Roosevelt and Wilson.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE VALUE AND USE OF WEALTH.

*Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*, pp. 225-240.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 177-216.

Follett, *The New State*, pp. 162-185.

Once when Jesus was journeying on the highway, a man ran up and knelt before him and asked, "Good Master, what must I do that I may inherit eternal life?" Jesus said to him, "Why do you call me good? No one is good except one only: God. You know the commandments: 'Do not commit adultery. Do not murder. Do not steal. Do not bear false witness. Do not defraud. Honor thy father and mother.'" He said to him, "Master, I have kept all these commands from my youth." Looking upon him, Jesus loved him and said, "One thing you lack; go, sell all that you have and give the proceeds to the poor, and you will have treasure in heaven. Then come with me." But at this his countenance fell, and he went away in sorrow, for he had great possessions.

Then Jesus looked around and said to his disciples, "How difficult it is for those who have wealth to come under the rule of God!" They were amazed at his words, but again he said, "Children, how difficult it is for those who trust in wealth to come under the rule of God. It is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to come under the rule of God." And they were so astonished that they exclaimed, "Then who can be saved?" Jesus looked at them and said, "With men it is impossible, but not with God, for with God everything is possible." *Mark 10: 17-27.*

Once as Jesus was sitting opposite the treasury of the temple, he watched the manner in which the people put in their money. Many rich men were putting in large sums, but a poor woman came and dropped in two small coins amounting to less than a penny. He called his disciples and said to them, "I assure you, this poor widow has given more than all the rest who have put their money into the treasury, for they have contributed out of their surplus, but she out of her poverty has contributed all that she owns, her very subsistence. *Mark 12: 41-44.*

He who is faithful to the smaller trust is faithful also to the larger, and he who is dishonest in the smaller is dishonest also in the larger trust. If therefore you have not been faithful in the use of worldly wealth, who will intrust to you the true riches? If you have not been faithful in what belongs to another, who will give you what is your own? *Luke 16: 10-12.* (*Shorter Bible translation.*)

#### I.

#### THE STANDARD BY WHICH JESUS MEASURED WEALTH.

It is significant that at least for three-fourths of his life Jesus was an active business man; hence his deep interest in economic questions. His occupation allied him primarily with

the laboring class. The Greek word ordinarily translated carpenter, means more exactly builder or constructor. Since most of the buildings were of stone, the work in wood included simply doors, shelves, floors, beams, and stairs. Probably Joseph and his sons constructed walls as well as the woodwork in the Nazareth buildings. Jesus himself reveals in his parables an intimate interest in all such occupations. Consider for example the parable of the two houses, one built on the sand, the other on the rocks. He shares with his disciples their interest in the foundations of the temple at Jerusalem.

Further evidence strongly suggests that Jesus was not only a manual laborer but also a master builder. The conversation in Luke 14:30, in which he urges the importance of considering the cost before beginning to build, reveals the practical experience of a man accustomed to advise those who wished to build. Many of his parables suggest the point of view of the employer of labor, as for example, that of the two sons who worked for their father, or the parable of the talents, and above all that of the vineyard keeper who employed laborers for different periods and insisted upon paying them the same wage. Jesus also appreciated the argument of the centurion who was accustomed to issue commands and to have those commands obeyed. Jesus' instructions to his disciples as he sent them away on a missionary tour reflect the point of view of a man experienced in organizing men and in directing their activities. All this accumulative evidence indicates that Jesus was a master builder and that he approached the problems connected with wealth from the point of view both of the employer and the employee. With his broad social spirit he made his measure of value the ultimate effect of wealth (whoever was its owner) upon the community.

It has often been assumed that Jesus condemned the accumulation of wealth, that he believed that men should live in poverty, and that the mere possession of wealth was in itself wrong. There is nothing, however, in either his teachings or in his life that justifies such a conclusion. He looked at wealth with the same cool judgment with which he surveyed all human affairs, noting its perils and its benefits. We find him associating freely with the wealthy as well as with the poor, and in no case do we find any condemnation of wealth as such.

It is true that he very frequently expressed sympathy for

the poor. That is of course natural. We ourselves note the suffering of the poor much more frequently and more easily than the sufferings of the rich. We find it easier to alleviate the sufferings of the poor than to lighten the burdens of the rich, so that it is natural that Jesus' sympathetic relations with the poor should be more frequently mentioned. Nevertheless, we find that as he associated with the rich, he spoke to them with the same frankness as to the poor, and that apparently he dealt with them likewise on terms of equality.

In his discussions regarding wealth he clearly had in mind chiefly its effect upon the individual and through him upon society. What danger would the possession of wealth have for the development of character of the individual? What were its temptations? What were the advantages to the individual? Inasmuch as he believed that it was the duty of the individual to devote himself and his possessions to the welfare of society as a whole, his conclusions regarding the value and perils of wealth were substantially the same as those of the wisest social reformers of to-day.

From the practical point of view of efficiency, what principles are embodied in Jesus' directions to his disciples in Luke 10: 3-11? Why do not wealthy people consider their wealth a burden or a handicap to success? Are the rich more or are they less envious of others than are the poor, and why?

## II.

### THE PERILS OF WEALTH.

While Jesus did not condemn wealth, he evidently agreed with the other moralist who declared that the love of wealth is the root of all evil. He fully realized that the possession of wealth, surrounding a man with temptations, might turn his attention away from social duties to selfish living. There is danger that wealth instead of being used merely as a means to promote the welfare of society will become in a man's mind an end in itself, that instead of developing a spirit of generosity it will promote a spirit of stinginess and selfishness. We find him strongly emphasizing, therefore, the dangers of

wealth. While he did not say it was impossible for a rich man to retain his wealth and still be a good man, he did say that "it is easier for a camel to go through a needle's eye than for a rich man to come under the rule of God." Wealth at times becomes a man's master; it should always be his servant.

The keenness of his judgment of human nature and the searching way in which he tested and attempted to cure its weaknesses are shown most clearly in the story of the rich man who asked him the way to inherit eternal life. Evidently the man was one of high moral character. All the commandments he had kept from his youth up. A clean-living man of integrity, he made a good impression upon Jesus. Nevertheless he was apparently something of a prig and disposed to estimate himself more highly than was justified by the facts. Jesus, therefore, pricked the bubble of his self-conceit and proposed to him a great adventure: "Sell all that you have and give the proceeds to the poor!" Jesus had clearly read the man's character aright. It was the love of wealth that was hindering him rather than anything else, for he was unable to meet this test of unselfishness. Refusing to give up his wealth, he went away sorrowing. His moral fiber had been sapped by his wealth-generated love of ease and power till he could no longer make the heroic sacrifice needed to fulfill the high mission to which Jesus called him. This very real peril is involved in the possession of wealth.

The dangers to the individual from the possession of wealth extend likewise to social classes. With no need of exertion or self-denial in order to secure a living or the comforts of life, the wealthy are much more likely than the poor to devote themselves to certain amusements which bring no benefit to society and to live merely for the pursuit of pleasure instead of for service. Jesus did not condemn the joyousness of living, but his emphasis was placed upon service; and when the pleasures of life are merely selfish, instead of social, they merit condemnation. A very considerable proportion of life's pleasures, when sought merely for personal enjoyment, are obtained by pandering to anti-social appetites which harm instead of improve society.

It is surrender to the temptations of wealth rather than its control which Jesus condemns. Akin to this is the complacent

self-satisfaction seen at times in those whose wealth enables them to satisfy their wants and to accomplish results without severe personal effort. They are apt to become conceited and unsympathetic, as did Dives in Jesus' parable of the rich man and Lazarus. Inherited wealth sometimes blinds its possessor's eyes to the real heroism and magnificent effort displayed by the poor to accomplish worthy ends. In their blindness the rich thus become hard and unjust.

The perils of wealth may also be felt by a whole nation or people through the ambitions and consequent evil actions of their rulers. It is a commonplace that a very considerable proportion of the wars of history have been caused by selfish economic desires. A country with great natural resources that are useful from the military viewpoint is likely to be overrun and sacked by military rulers of other countries seeking wealth through plunder. The love of wealth, therefore, becomes not merely a temptation which may ruin individual character, but it may be a chief influence for the promotion of militarism and the political and social evils that accompany the war spirit. Inasmuch as wealth is in itself a source of power, inasmuch as it tempts individuals as well as rulers to acquire the means of exercising power, it constitutes thus internationally another peril. It seems clear now that one of the several motives underlying the promotion of the economic development of Germany during the last century was the desire that the spirit of overlordship might attain its satisfaction. The development of the economic resources of a country, when turned toward the increase of the comforts and of the intellectual and moral welfare of the individuals in the community, can have only good results; but the same development, when used for the promotion of unworthy claims such as the assertion of power over others and the oppression of the weak, merits only condemnation.

Explain why the desire of France to control the iron mines of southwest Germany (the Saar valley) after the war is not a fair illustration of the temptation that wealth offers?

Explain the desire of Japan to control the great iron and coal mines of China. Give facts and reasons for your conclusions.

## III.

## THE ACQUISITION OF WEALTH.

Connected with the ambitious lust for the possession of wealth there have arisen many questions which require careful thought for their solution and which have seriously puzzled well-intentioned, thinking people. At various periods of history there have arisen political and social parties whose principles had to do with the accumulation and distribution of wealth. For example, the French and German communists of the middle of the nineteenth century, recognizing many of the evils that came from the unequal distribution of wealth, reached the conclusion that all wealth should be held in common and that private property, in distinction from the property of the community, should be condemned. With a vivid conception of the evils that come at times from private possession of great wealth, Proudhon declared that "property is theft." In somewhat extreme terms the socialists of every school advocate the ownership of all the means of production in a community by the State, to be administered through the Government.

In their misinterpretation of the spirit of the New Testament, some of these extreme theorists have spoken of Jesus as a communist, or even as the first of the Socialists. In some of the experiments in communism that have been attempted on a small scale there has been at first much of the unselfish spirit of Jesus. They have generally failed, however, because in time the normal nature of men reasserted itself and normal inequalities in ability and leadership brought about a return to the custom of private property holding. We may conceive of a co-operative commonwealth in which there would be freely chosen government officials changing readily at the people's will and unselfishly performing their tasks, while the individual citizens still felt their personal responsibilities and acted accordingly.

Such a conception is as old as Plato at least, and probably much older. The most successful attempts at the Socialistic state, in which the Government has owned the productive property and managed industry and the people, have been despotic like ancient Sparta. While, for a time, perhaps, successful from the military viewpoint, they have eventually failed to develop individual personality among the people.

Indeed in the light of history as well as of psychology, the whole idea of the control and the direction of the activities of a community by the Government, whether in connection with wealth or otherwise, is directly contrary to the spirit of the teachings of Jesus, for the control of the activities of society by a government is in direct opposition to the self-development of the mass of citizens. It tends as a matter of experience to lessen the responsibilities and therefore the development of the average man in society instead of increasing them. Jesus, on the other hand, as we have seen, continually emphasized the importance of the individual and the development of the individual's will and intellect through placing upon him the responsibility for his own decisions and acts.

The extreme reformer of to-day, going beyond the teachings of Jesus, often condemns the accumulation of great fortunes and advocates that the government by means of taxation or sometimes by direct prohibition limit strictly the amount of wealth that shall be accumulated by any individual. Doubtless the acquisition of wealth should be placed under strict limitations as to the methods employed, in order to guard against the dangers of improper use. However, if wealth is properly used and if proper means are employed in its acquisition, it may become one of the chief sources of benefit both to individuals and to the community. All measures of public control should be scrutinized and applied with due consideration for the common interests of both the individual and of society. Care should be taken not to check individual initiative nor to prevent the proper development of individual ambition.

The limit of the power of the individual to accumulate wealth or to employ it wisely can hardly be measured by rule. It has often been asserted that no man can really earn during his lifetime a million dollars and that therefore the ownership of that amount of wealth in itself is proof of evil-doing. Such a view overlooks the enormous importance of organization as a means of accomplishment, and also the inestimable value of good judgment and administrative ability in all types of social work.

In military affairs it is readily conceded that a military genius like Napoleon or Field Marshal Foch may contribute more toward the winning of a great battle or of a war than

hundreds of thousands or even millions of individual men who serve as the units of battle. The same fact is equally true in business administration. A very large percentage of waste in business comes from lack of organization, and a business leader who knows how to organize a business employing many thousands of men, so that the waste of energy is reduced to the minimum and each man's strength employed to the best advantage, may be the means of producing more wealth than thousands of individuals whose work is merely routine. It frequently is true that, under the modern methods of business organization, the difference between a highly profitable business and a bankrupt business is entirely dependent upon the managing skill of an individual. Therefore, it is entirely impossible to place any limit upon the amount of wealth that may really be produced by any individual. It may well run high into the millions.

Doubtless the economic welfare of a community should be measured by the standard of living of the masses rather than by the wealth of the few. And here thrift becomes vital. It is an undeniable fact that the result of the sudden great increase during the World War in the wages of many workers was not a real improvement in their standards of living but instead, the added wealth developed a carelessness and laziness in their work which lessened greatly their efficiency, and it encouraged an extravagance in their expenditures which weakened instead of strengthened their moral fiber. The same effects were traceable among the rich.

The development of thrift among all classes is absolutely essential if increased wealth is to produce good rather than evil results. Concentration in business organization on a large scale is necessary to insure the best and cheapest production which is the needed preliminary to the highest social welfare. This large concentration can be brought about only by the organized use of wealth in the hands of a relatively few men, or better, by the concentration of the smaller holdings of wealth from the savings of the many invested in great corporations or in co-operative enterprises.

In proportion to the productivity and thrift of each, men acquire not only wealth but the power to gain more wealth and influence and in consequence to improve living conditions. "To him who has shall be given." If men are not diligent and

thrifty, wealth in their hands does not aid their fellows but often injures society. It is thus seen that the problems of wealth are primarily moral, and the penetrating insight of Jesus into these problems touches the very heart of the social and economic questions of the day. Ambitious and sympathetic reformers need Jesus' calm observance of facts regarding the use of money and time, as well as his sympathy and kindly spirit.

To fix the limit of profits solely on moral grounds with only the public good in view is hard, probably impossible. Much depends upon the use made of the surplus. If it is given largely to the employers, most of it will be reinvested in business and will tend to increase the demand for labor with higher wages, and by increasing the supply of goods to reduce prices and the cost of living. If given to thrifty workmen, the result will be quite similar; if to spendthrifts, either employers or workmen, much of it will be wasted. If it is wasted in ways that are injurious to individuals or to society, as in debauchery, by drink or lewd living, positive damage worse than waste results. If the public service rendered by a business is great and worth its cost to the consumer, it may well be that society will be most benefited by large profits so reinvested as to extend the service as rapidly as possible. This might well be better for the public than an abnormal increase in wages and salaries which would tend to demoralize other industries not in a position to follow, or than a reduction in price to the public which would check the rapid development of the business. Of course, the welfare of the mass of the community is the goal; the means to attain this are multiform and complex.

What reasons, if any, are there for thinking that waste is less characteristic of the wealthy than of the poor? Why cannot ten men working separately, with one thousand dollars of capital each, produce ordinarily as much in business as one man with ten thousand dollars capital? Try to prove whether or how or why it is harmful for the United States that eighty-five per cent of the wealth is held by approximately fifteen per cent of its population. From the value to society, what limit, if any, should be fixed to the amount of wealth that should be held by one individual? Or by any group of individuals? To

what extent would it be better and to what extent would it be possible to give to manual workers a larger wage in order that they might contribute more to public enterprises? How can this change be brought about except through the increased productivity and thrift of the wage-earners?

#### IV.

##### THE TRUSTEESHIP OF WEALTH.

It has become a commonplace of the later days that a wealthy man is a "trustee" of his wealth, which is to be used in the end for the benefit of the community. This principle clearly represents the Christian point of view. Even among the early Hebrews it is evident that this idea was the basis of their economic institutions. The oldest son became the head of the ancient family because the responsibility rested upon him of using his wealth for the benefit of the entire family or clan. As Jesus in his life and teachings expanded the idea of a family so as to include humanity as a whole, so this conception of the trusteeship of wealth for the benefit of an individual family is extended in the spirit of Jesus to the idea of a trusteeship for the benefit of the community.

We see some of the modern problems touched upon indirectly by Jesus in certain of his teachings. In the parable of the master of the vineyard who, hiring men from the morning until near the close of day, sent them each into his vineyard to work, but at the close of the day paid them all the same amount regardless of the hours they had labored, we see two ideas that are apparently applicable at the present time. In the first place, it is asserted with vigor and emphasis that the employer must assume the responsibility of controlling his own business. In the second place it plainly teaches that the employer and the community must keep in mind the responsibility of providing labor for those willing to work. The vineyard owner in the parable was not concerned solely about securing laborers. When able-bodied men were standing idle simply, as they asserted, because they had no work, he took them into his employ. In giving those who had worked only an hour a wage equal to that of the regular laborers, he seemed to recognize the fact that a certain amount was necessary for the comfort of each individual, and that even though certain

men's labor had not been so productive as others', it was wise and just to give them enough to satisfy their pressing needs. Into the economic problem he also injected that brotherly love without which no difficult industrial question can ever be justly and satisfactorily settled. It may be questioned how far the principle of the minimum wage was in the mind of Jesus, yet there is at least a strong implication that the idea of a living wage was present. However this may be, the thought of the trusteeship of wealth, and its wise use under all social conditions, runs throughout his teachings, for he viewed all industrial problems equally from the point of view of the employer and the employee, and aimed to influence each to guard the other's interests as they did their own.

Jesus condemned so vigorously the hypocrisy of the Pharisees who made long prayers but devoured widow's houses, and his sense of reality and the fitness of things was so keen while his sympathy with the poor and suffering was so deep, that he doubtless intended to emphasize the obligation of the rich to use their wealth so far as was possible in caring for the ills and wants of the worthy poor. Indeed it seems to-day as if this were almost the sole dependable source of some of our greatest benefactions for education, scientific research and discovery, medical and sanitary relief on a world-wide scale.

Why is a wealthy man still under moral obligation to contribute to charity even if he pays taxes to support the poor? In what sense do you interpret Jesus' teaching, "It is more blessed to give than to receive"? Explain why an able business man probably benefits the community more by employing the bulk of his wealth in business than by giving it away. How far is the demand that laborers shall receive just wages met by paying them in proportion to the quantity and quality of the services they render as shown by their productivity? What limits should be placed upon this principle?

## V.

### PRACTICAL CHRISTIAN CHARITY.

It is evident that Jesus measured the true value of wealth to the individual primarily by the spirit and purpose of the owner. In the incident of the contributions to

the temple treasury, when many rich men were giving a large amount of money and a poor widow came and dropped in two small coins amounting to less than a penny, he assured his disciples that this poor woman had given more than all the rest who had put their money into the treasury. It was because they had contributed out of their surplus but she out of her poverty had contributed all that she owned, her very means of subsistence. She had thus given with sacrifice out of spiritual passion, in the spirit of true charity; she had strikingly exemplified from the viewpoint of the individual one use that should be made of wealth, however large or small the amount.

The same idea is brought out in his injunction that we should not lay up our treasures on earth where moth and rust may corrupt and where thieves may break through and steal, but rather should lay up our treasures in heaven. This teaching penetrates deeply into the heart of things; it represents the judgment of individuals by their motives, which as we have seen is the only true basis of judgment of the individual.

Another point of view, however, of a very practical nature, showing his keenness of insight into the ways in which business is often conducted, is found in the parable of the steward of the rich man who had been accused of faithlessness in his stewardship. When called to account, he settled with his debtors by relieving them of most of their obligations, in order that he might thus win their friendship even though at the expense of his master. The master, however, recognized the shrewdness of his unfaithful steward and commended his sagacity. Jesus turned the illustration to good account by saying that men should make friends for themselves by so using the wealth of this world that when it fails they may secure entrance and a welcome into their eternal home. Here again Jesus is calling attention not to the steward's crooked dealing, but to his foresight and to the spirit as well as the way in which Christian charity should be administered, if the individual himself is to reap the benefit of his generosity.

There has often been ironical criticism of the practical work of our charity organization societies and of persons who attempt to protect themselves against fraud by a careful inquiry into the character and needs of beggars and others soliciting aid. It has often been assumed that this is contrary

to the spirit of Jesus' teachings, inasmuch as he said, "Give to him who asks of you," when in the sermon on the mount he was urging men to conquer their evil desires and weaknesses and to attain self-control and the spirit of public service. There is, however, nothing in the spirit of Jesus' teachings that suggests such a condemnation of common sense in the dispensing of charity. To pauperize or to encourage deceit in one's fellow men is not a worthy gift either to them or to society. Throughout Jesus' life he seems to have been the embodiment of justice and common sense, and nowhere in literature can we find more bitter condemnation of hypocrisy and deceit than in the words of Jesus. Indeed his approval of the spirit of truth and his abhorrence of lying is basic in his character and in his life, and may always be assumed where not specifically expressed in his teachings.

What are the leading features of a minimum wage law? Why is it not kind to the individual nor beneficial to the community to give alms to a fraudulent beggar? Explain the difference in the results upon society if Mr. Carnegie, instead of having given largely to the public libraries and to funds for scientific research, had devoted his wealth to reducing the cost of all household commodities manufactured from steel? How could he, as a practical matter, have so reduced prices of household commodities?

## VI.

### CONTROL OF WEALTH BY THE STATE.

Much has been said by certain writers of the attitude that Jesus would probably have taken toward the doctrines of communism, anarchism, and socialism. For this discussion, communism means the ownership of wealth in common by the whole community; anarchism means the absence of governmental control, and the administration of affairs, including government and business, by voluntary groups of individuals; socialism means the ownership and management of capital in every community by society acting through the organized government. Of course, the form of political organization must vary with the type of civilization and the needs of the time, and no form is therefore to be considered final or ideal. The essential thing is that the citizens possess the spirit of

Jesus' teachings. In our days and with our civilization a real democracy seems to fit best his teachings.

As we have seen, Jesus was a strong individualist, believing perhaps as much if not more than any other of the great teachers that society is an organization of independent thinking and acting individuals. There is nothing in his teachings to contradict the view of Aristotle regarding private property. Aristotle believed that the individual would have little interest in wealth that he did not own, and that, considering human nature as it is, the principle of private property is a practical incentive to proper activity and vigor in the production and administration of wealth.

Jesus doubtless recognized this fundamental fact; but he added to the individualistic spirit of the ancient wise men the thought that the individual should possess public spirit. While he should devote himself and his wealth to the good of others, this act should be voluntary. To secure the greatest advantage for himself and for society, the public use of his wealth should be on his own initiative and not under the compulsion of the government or of other individuals. Jesus clearly recognized the fact, as do the best thinkers of to-day, that there is no moral value to the individual in acts done contrary to his will under the compulsion of others, including the state, since human motive is the determining element in character. The individual must determine his charity and must decide the nature and the amount of public service that he will render if he is to get the greatest benefit. When all or a large part of the individuals in a country devote themselves to the public service, we have a state approaching the highest ideal.

This statement in no sense implies that individuals should not be put under the control of government. Indeed under present conditions, with large accumulations of wealth administered by relatively few people and these often selfish, it becomes essential that they should be put under some measure of control. Doubtless, not merely the teachings of Jesus but the experience of history from his time to the present, show that the best work and the most successful administration of both government and the organizations for the production of wealth, can be secured through the stimulus of individual initiative and the making of decisions by individuals. We may repeat, nevertheless, that those individuals and their decisions may

well be under a measure of control. The control emphasized by Jesus is the control of the will of God or the direction of a man's acts by an educated conscience. There is nothing, however, in his teachings to imply that there should not also be the control of law and of the government. Indeed there is the strongest implication that individuals should submit themselves to the law and that, as Paul later stated, each individual should be subject to the higher powers of the state and of the government. Each individual should, for his own sake as well as for that of the state, willingly put himself under this control and thus direct his affairs in harmony with others for the public good.

In the administration of public charity, why would you prefer voluntary to paid workers, or how would you arrange work for both? Why do more cities own and manage their water works than their street railroads or their electric lighting plants? What does the parable of the talents suggest regarding Jesus' attitude toward the private ownership of wealth?

#### *Subjects for Further Study.*

(1) Look up carefully the work of the Rockefeller Endowment for Medical Research and that of the Carnegie Institute for Scientific Research at Washington and decide whether private endowments or government appropriations prove more effective in such work. Give full reasons for your opinion.

(2) Distinguish carefully between socialism and social reform, between anarchism and nihilism, between syndicalism and trade unionism.

(3) What would be the effect upon business and the welfare of society if all our wealthy citizens gave all their income above their necessary living expenses to public charities?

(4) Discuss the plan by which John Leitch in his "Man-to-Man" proposes to apply the Golden Rule to modern industry.

## CHAPTER VII.

### RECREATION AND THE CHRISTIAN USE OF THE SABBATH.

#### *Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*, pp. 212-219.  
Edwards, *Popular Amusements*.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 217-247.  
Follett, *The New State*, pp. 189-203.

Once when John's disciples and the Pharisees were observing a fast, people came to Jesus and said, "Why do the disciples of John and the disciples of the Pharisees fast, but your disciples not fast?" Jesus said to them, "Can guests fast at a wedding while the bridegroom is with them? As long as they have the bridegroom with them they cannot fast. But the time will come when the bridegroom is taken away from them; then they will fast. No one sews a piece of unshrunken cloth on an old coat; otherwise the patch breaks away from it, the new from the old, and the tear is made worse. No man pours new wine into old wine-skins; otherwise the new wine bursts the skins, and both the wine and the wine-skins are lost. Instead new wine is poured into fresh wine-skins." *Mark 2: 18-22.*

"To what shall I compare this generation? It is like children sitting in the market-place, who call to their playmates and say:

'We played the pipes for you but you would not dance,  
We cried but you would not lament.'

For John came neither eating nor drinking, and men said, 'He is possessed by an evil spirit!' The Son of Man came eating and drinking, and men say, 'He is a glutton and a drunkard, a friend of tax-gatherers and outcasts!' But Wisdom is vindicated by its works." *Matt. 11: 16-19.*

One Sabbath Jesus was passing through the grain fields; and his disciples, as they made their way through, began to pull off the heads of the grain. The Pharisees said to him, "Sir, why are they doing things that on the Sabbath are unlawful." He said to them, "Have you never read what David did when he and his followers were in need and hungry, how he went into the house of God, when Abiathar was high priest, and ate the consecrated bread which only the priests are allowed to eat, and gave it also to those with him?" And he said to him, "The Sabbath was made for man, and not man for the Sabbath; so that the Son of Man is master even of the Sabbath." *Mark 2: 23-28. (Shorter Bible translation.)*

## I.

### JESUS' APPRECIATION OF RECREATION.

The early Mark narrative makes it perfectly clear that Jesus appreciated and enjoyed all wholesome forms of recreation. His life with his disciples illustrates this fact. One of the chief charges that the long-faced Pharisees brought against him was that his disciples never fasted as did the followers of John the Baptist. In reply to the charge, Jesus admitted its truth and explained the reason. The figure of a marriage feast, by which he described his life with his followers, represented the highest form of social joy and recreation known to the world of his day. It was the one week in the life of the bride and groom when they were relieved of the ordinary cares and drudgery and when they and their guests were free to give themselves up wholly to feasting and to the simple sports that enlivened the grim monotony of their rather sordid existence. Singing,

dancing, feasting and simple dramatic representation characterized these oriental wedding feasts in which all members of the community shared. In face of the surprise and contemptuous disapproval of the Pharisees, Jesus freely accepted many invitations to banquets which were showered upon him. The indications are clear that he was a welcomed guest on such occasions. Some of his most significant work was done as he participated in the festivities of a banquet. That sparkling yet kindly humor which bubbles forth so often in his recorded teachings must have enriched and enlivened these feasts where men forgot for the moment their hot pursuit of wealth and personal ambitions and played whole-heartedly with their fellows.

Feasts and banquets figure prominently in the short stories or parables that Jesus told to illustrate his teachings. Even the touching story of the prodigal ends with a great feast. In his friendships, in his work, in his recreation Jesus found genuine joy and happiness, and was eager that his fellows should do the same. His reference to the game played by the children on the streets indicates that he was familiar with it and suggests that as a boy he was fond of the sports with which the children relieved the tedium of the monotonous life at Nazareth.

One of the reasons why children came rushing to his arms was probably because they recognized that he sympathized with them in their love of play. Not until dogmatism and asceticism in the fourth and following centuries laid their chilling hands on Christianity did it lose the spontaneity which characterized it as it came fresh from the stamp of Jesus' own personality.

How many references to banquets or feasts are there in the Gospels? What did Jesus mean by refusing to put new wine in old wine-skins? What examples of humor are there in Jesus' recorded teachings?

## II.

### THE PSYCHOLOGICAL BASIS OF RECREATION.

In giving recreation a large place in the beloved community that Jesus established in the Greater Capernaum, he built squarely on the foundation laid in human nature by God

himself. Man cannot live by work alone. His body and mind require relaxation and re-creation if they are to continue to do their part effectively. The more strenuous the task and the more advanced the civilization, the more imperative the need for periods of relaxation.

Modern psychology teaches us that recreation means release from tension and the reversion to instinctive forms of activity to which we and our ancestors for countless ages have been accustomed. It is recreative chiefly because it means temporary release from the killing pace which our strenuous civilization sets for us and the doing of those things which are pleasurable, largely because they are natural and familiar; they therefore call for little or no mental effort. Thus the business or professional man, compelled by his occupation to sit upright in stiff chairs and to use his brain almost incessantly at the expense of his body, finds keen delight and perfect recreation in a game of golf, for it enables him suddenly and completely to shake off all these chafing restrictions and revert to his primitive instincts. Like a boy he swings a club and scrambles up and down hills and through woods and ravines in pursuit of a small object at which he frequently hits sometimes with great vigor and sometimes with gently measured taps, as did his ancestors countless centuries ago.

Recreation with many still consists in eating. Nothing delights and recreates them more than to smell the reek of the roasting meat and to satisfy to the full their voracious appetites as did their forbears in the old stone age. Others find their chief recreation in gratifying the lower animal passions even though at infinite peril and loss to themselves and society.

We have succeeded fairly well in the era just past in teaching people how to think and work effectively, but we have not taught the great majority how to play. It is not in doing our tasks but in our hours of recreation that we as a people fall below our accepted moral standards. It is in the use of their leisure time, in their recreations, that many — both young and old — barter their spiritual birthright for a pitiable mess of pottage. The physical and moral wreckage that lies in the wake of the public dance hall, the popular amusement places, and the low theatre is appalling. One of the chief problems of the twentieth century is to provide clean, even beneficial, types and places of amusement and to teach young

and old how to play and to find real recreation that will not cost them their most valuable possessions.

What forms of recreation appeal to you as the most attractive? As the most rewarding? What forms are most popular among the young people of your community? How does the element of competition contribute to recreation? Why are the social forms of recreation as a rule better than the more individualistic? Why are many sports like base ball and boat racing accompanied by gambling on the part of many?

### III.

#### THE ATTITUDE OF THE CHURCH TOWARD PLAY AND RECREATION.

The strength of the early Hebrew religion was that, like Jesus, it frankly recognized the need which each individual felt for recreation, and provided for it. Moses demanded of the autocratic Pharaoh: "Let my people go, that they may keep a feast with dancing to me in the desert." This was the surprising demand about which centered the titanic struggle that resulted in the birth of the Hebrew nation. Throughout all this early history the three annual festivals of the Hebrews were occasions at which old and young, rich and poor, took food and drink and amidst music and song and glad rejoicing feasted at their sanctuaries, and with the consciousness of Jehovah's approval found recreation of body, mind, and soul. These annual festivals were the most joyous events in their lives. Attendance upon them was not a burden but their supreme joy. The same happy spirit rings through the liturgical psalms of the Psalter. From the first, religion and recreation were closely wedded, and whenever they are separated both suffer.

The life of the early Christian communities was equally joyous. Even the evening supper which they celebrated together in remembrance of the days when Jesus was with them in the body was often so hilarious that certain of the Church Fathers were shocked. It was not until the alien motive of asceticism and monasticism during the third and following centuries transformed its life that Christianity lost its joyousness. Most of the popular forms of amusement and

recreation were abandoned by the church, and the Puritans in their zeal to stress the ethical principles of Christianity completed the divorce between religion and recreation. Banished from the church, many forms of amusement lost their fine recreative character and in part merited the condemnations that were uttered against them by the religious leaders. Even music was excluded from certain Protestant churches, and the people were given only a small part in the ritual. Religion was presented as a stern duty rather than a joyous privilege, with the deplorable but inevitable result that a majority of the young people, forced to look elsewhere for their recreation, aside from their helpful athletic sports, are found too frequently at the dance halls, low theatres and even less desirable places of popular amusement rather than in the churches. As a result of its early mistakes, the attitude of the church toward many forms of popular amusement is still negative rather than positive and constructive. Thus modern organized Christianity has lost much of that joyousness and appeal to the innate need for recreation which was one of the chief charms of the good news that Jesus proclaimed to the hungering and lost of his day.

How far do you approve of the remark of a Congregational deacon who said he voted to introduce dancing in the parish house of his church because, "If we do not let our young people dance under Christian auspices they will dance in the public hall across the way, where I know the devil presides"? What practical efforts are different churches making to unite again religion and recreation? How far can and should the churches in their public services meet the craving of each individual for genuine recreation?

#### IV.

#### THE REGULATION AND DIRECTION OF POPULAR AMUSEMENTS.

The regulation of popular amusements is undoubtedly one of the most vital and insistent as well as difficult problems before humanity to-day. Detailed surveys have shown that often as high as ninety per cent of the delinquent girls arraigned before our police courts took the first plunge into vice in connec-

tion with commercialized amusement resorts. The play impulse is instinctive, universal, and perfectly natural, but if wrongly directed it destroys the physical, mental and spiritual life of the individual with a rapidity and completeness that are appalling. Because the desire for amusement is so strong and so universal and in itself so normal and innocent, it offers a powerful temptation to the unprincipled exploiter. Such exploitation is easy, largely because the church and organized society have failed to recognize the validity of that desire and have left to the most unprincipled members of society the task of satisfying it. The result is that to-day many if not most of the popular forms of amusement are highly commercialized and are managed simply with a view to rolling up the box-office receipts and not to giving the public wholesome recreation. Not only do these private corporations take millions of dollars from their patrons, but too often they lower their ideals and lure them on to commit crime against society. As Jane Addams has said on the basis of her wide observation and experience: "The Anglo-Saxon city has turned over the provision for public recreation to the most evil-minded and the most unscrupulous members of the community" (*Spirit of Youth*, p. 7). In certain social strata in our congested city life the popular forms of amusement are crimes. Experience too has shown that when sin and vice are commercialized they tend to become shameless and impudent. In the careful Kansas City survey of commercialized amusements (which did not include saloons, medical museums, social clubs and cabarets), thirty-two per cent were found to be unquestionably bad and only one attained the standard of eighty-four per cent good.

Against those who thus exploit the innate love of play and recreation and against those who through neglect permit these wrongs to exist, Jesus' words of warning still apply: "It is inevitable that temptation should come, but woe to the man through whom it comes; it would be better for him to be flung into the sea with a millstone about his neck than that he cause one of these little ones to fall!"

The followers of Jesus are under solemn obligation to fight courageously, systematically and persistently all who exploit those who have little wisdom or little experience or little moral strength. Scientific investigation and experience have indicated many practical ways to help. As a rule the exact facts

can be ascertained only through the systematic investigations of skilled experts, working quietly under the direction of wise Christian citizens. Repeated investigations are necessary. Sensational publicity usually hurts more than it helps this reform. In most cities the results of such investigations can be used most effectively in personal interviews with the managers of the commercialized amusements or as a guide to legislative and police control. Organized and intelligent Christian citizenship can in most communities accomplish much in correcting the more flagrant evils. If a municipal license is required for each form of commercialized amusement, the public holds in its hands the power to repress what is obnoxious and to raise the standard of the rest. The problem resolves itself into (1) the education of public opinion, (2) the election of reliable officials, and (3) the co-operation of the Christian citizens to see that worthy standards are maintained and applied.

In dealing with the problems connected with the theatre, the methods and practical co-operation of the Drama League of America, the Catholic Theatre Movement, and similar organizations are well worthy of careful consideration. Such organizations suggest lists of desirable plays or assist in forming local study courses and children's dramatic clubs that contribute directly toward educating public opinion, and they are preferable to any official censorship which is inevitably personal and often ignorant. Experience is also demonstrating that the evils of the public dance hall can be largely eliminated if a trained supervisor, preferably some woman who has had practical experience as a teacher or mother, is always present and is given authority and the support of the police.

The church too is beginning to awaken to its obligation to furnish wholesome and attractive recreation adapted to the needs and interests of different ages. The Boy Scouts, the Girl Scouts, the Campfire Girls, educational motion pictures, amateur dramatics, and especially the presentation of Biblical subjects, are only a few of the many movements that are finding hearty welcome and support in many modern churches. If these forms of popular amusement are made in each case an opportunity for the larger self-expression of youth, and the leadership is placed, as far as is practicable, in the hands of the young people themselves, these movements will go far to counteract the baneful influence of the vicious commercialized forms

of amusement and to develop noble Christian manhood and womanhood.

The church can also do much to promote clean athletics. Betting, gambling, and professionalism can best be combated through frank and open discussion. They are doomed as soon as they are condemned by the ruling public opinion in a community. It is even more important to democratize athletics, so that not a few skilled athletes but hundreds and thousands in amateur teams can have the physical and moral inspiration of regular and active participation in wholesome sports.

What are the aims of the Drama League of America? What are the educational and recreational values and the dangers in the modern motion picture exhibitions? Why is gambling a pernicious form of amusement? How can our public parks be further utilized so as to meet the demand for popular amusement?

## V.

### JESUS' INTERPRETATION OF THE SABBATH.

There is no evidence that Jesus ever brought a sacrifice to the temple or followed the minute directions of the Jewish ceremonial law; on the other hand he raised no protest against any ceremonial form that was of value to his fellow men. When, however, an institution became a hindrance rather than an aid to man's development, he refused to let his followers be bound by it. His protest usually first found expression through his quiet refusal to observe it rather than through public utterance. Thus, for example, he did not encourage his disciples to observe the onerous Pharisaic regulations regarding ceremonial ablutions before meals. When the Pharisees charged him with disregarding this law, he admitted the charge and clearly stated his reason (Mark 7: 1-16).

In the same way and with deliberate purpose he broke the heavy bonds which the Old Testament priestly editors and the later scribes had laid upon the Sabbath, but nowhere is it recorded that he criticized those who conscientiously followed the minute rules which the Pharisees had formulated to guard its sanctity. The extreme emphasis on the Sabbath as an institution was in part the result of the peculiar conditions

growing out of the Babylonian exile, which to the Jews of the dispersion still presented the vital problem of preserving their racial unity and religious faith in the face of overwhelming temptations. Removed far from the temple, they ceased perforce to observe the majority of their ceremonial rites. Circumcision and the Sabbath were practically the only distinctive institutions that could be maintained apart from the temple. Hence Judaism clung to them as a drowning man to a plank and made their punctilious observance the supreme test of loyalty to their race and to their God.

It therefore required great courage on the part of Jesus to break with the formal regulations that had gathered about the Sabbath. He did so deliberately and with a lofty purpose, but by act rather than word. As a survival of ancient communism, Jewish law permitted every man to help himself to the grain growing in the fields, provided he ate it on the spot, but the law explicitly forbade him to do the work involved in this act on the Sabbath. Jesus allowed his disciples to help themselves to the grain on the Sabbath, because they needed food and because it was the normal, reasonable thing for them to do. He was undoubtedly well aware that this act would at once call forth a protest from the Pharisees, as it did. He first defended it, quite in the spirit of the scribal teachers of his day, by citing the example of David who, when he and his followers needed food, took and ate of the showbread which according to the ceremonial law was to be eaten only by the priests. Then having precipitated the whole issue between the ceremonial and the vital, spiritual interpretation of religion, he laid down the only sound philosophical basis for the interpretation and observation of the ancient institution: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath."

This revolutionary statement was only a corollary of the larger principle that Jesus repeatedly set forth: Forms and institutions are never ends in themselves, but valuable simply as they promote man's development; only in this way are they significant in the sight of God. In the light of this luminous principle the minute Pharisaic regulations that impeded man's free and full development were a crime against God as well as man. It was inevitable that Jesus should attack them, for his mission was to enable men to know the truth that the truth might make them free. Far from abrogating the institution

of the Sabbath, he interpreted it, as had the great Hebrew prophets before him, as God's good gift to man to be used to promote the physical and mental, as well as the social and religious welfare of each individual. It mattered little what ancient priests and scribes had said about it; the vital question was, how could it be made to yield the most to toiling, heavily laden men who possessed divine potentialities?

What were some of the minute regulations which the later Jewish lawgivers had imposed on the Sabbath? What was their motive in so doing? Why did they fail to attain their objects? What is the difference between their method and that of Jesus?

## VI.

### THE EFFECTIVE CHRISTIAN USE OF THE SABBATH.

Unfortunately in interpreting the Sabbath the Protestant church in the past has followed more closely the teachings of the ancient priests and Pharisees than those of Jesus. He sought to sweep away with one stroke the prohibitions which had already made it a day of repression rather than of joy and re-creation. Lest there should be any misunderstanding, he fortified his teaching by his own example. The early records tell us that apparently on this day he redoubled his acts of mercy and healing. To the criticisms of the Pharisees he replied: "Is it right on the Sabbath day to do good or to do harm, to save a life or to kill?" The question is full of suggestion: their interpretation of the day was doing harm and killing, even as the same interpretation has since that day done countless harm and killed the faith of many in Christian homes and communities where the teachings not of Jesus but of the Pharisees have been thoroughly followed.

With few exceptions the attitude of the churches to-day toward the still burning questions of how to use this day of rest is negative, like that of the Pharisees, and not positive like that of Jesus. Has not the time come to formulate the Christian ideal of the Sabbath? That ideal must be based squarely on the needs and possibilities of man. Scientific experimentation has demonstrated conclusively that continuous work without relaxation is wise neither from the economic nor from the physical point of view. The experiences of the Great War,

especially in Great Britain where the tests were scientifically made, prove this point beyond doubt. When, in order to increase the output of the munition factories, the working hours were made to include seven days in the week and often from fourteen to sixteen hours a day, it was found that within a very short time the total output of the factories decreased instead of increased. A careful investigation by the committee appointed to study the conditions soon led to the conclusion that from the point of view of output alone it was essential that men and women work not more than six days continuously. In order that the machinery might be kept at its highest efficiency, in many cases the rest-Sabbath of the munition factories was a revolving one. The day of the week that was reserved was immaterial so far as the individual worker was concerned, but experience taught that the principle of one day's rest in seven had to be as carefully followed as that of restricting the number of working hours in each day so that abundant time for sleep and recreation was furnished. One of the primary uses of the Sabbath, therefore, must ever be to offer an opportunity for physical and mental rest and recreation to all who toil. (Bulletin, United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, No. 221, "*Hours, Fatigue and Health in British Munition Factories.*")

Experience, as well as the great Interpreter of life, teaches that "man does not live by bread alone." It is an obvious fact that, even though many do not recognize it, all need moral, social and spiritual re-creation. The day of rest from physical and mental work is a vast open door of opportunity through which each man may enter into a larger life. It may be through meditation, through worship, through intellectual inspiration, through service, through contact with nature, or through the many other ways in which man may enter into closer and more intelligent and loving companionship and co-operation with his fellow man and the Source of all life and love. Fortunately there are as many ways as there are individuals. We may guide but not compel our fellow men to take one or the other of these ways. The Gospel narratives indicate that Jesus on the Sabbath sometimes took his disciples into the synagogue, sometimes into active social service among the poor and needy, and sometimes, even in the face of the protests of the religious authorities of the day, out into the fields where they were left free to follow their normal inclinations. Where he went and

found joy and recreation, they went too. In developing the higher uses of the Sabbath, he did not give men advice; he gave himself. It is obvious that if parents and teachers are to lead their children in this noble quest, they too must give themselves. They must also find joy and happiness in it, for these are contagious and irresistible.

To some of us who were brought up at the feet of the Puritans it seems a crime to laugh and be happy on the Sabbath. Jesus taught that not to do so was the supreme crime. In the light of Jesus' interpretation of the Sabbath purely from the point of view of its service to the individual, we must evaluate anew each element in the Sunday program of our churches. Are the pews filled simply through force of habit or the compulsion of community conscience, or are they empty because the people who might fill them do not find in the services the re-creation and inspiration they need? Is the Church School rearing happy, efficient Christian citizens? As the foundation of the life of the church and community, are there Christian homes which are developing the rich possibilities of the Sabbath to the full? Does the day of cessation from ordinary labor mean for each class and individual in the community rich opportunities for recreation and growth improved in proportion as each is able? These are the questions that must be answered constructively, if we are to have a Christian Sabbath.

Our best modern psychology teaches that recreation and religion are closely related. Real recreation gives to the individual temporary relaxation and happiness through experiences and emotions that are passing; real religion gives him abiding peace and happiness through beliefs, experiences and emotions that reach out into eternity. But the highest forms of recreation, such as music or art or constructive work or social service merge into religion. This close unity perhaps throws new light on the place of recreation in the Sabbath program — especially for the young. Recreation is the natural path leading on to the higher forms of activity and feeling that merge into religion. Viewed in the light of man's needs and of Jesus' example the Christian Sabbath is that which gives to each individual not only rest but physical, mental, social, and spiritual re-creation. The realization of this ideal in the home, the church, and the community is one of the vital tasks which the followers of the great Teacher are called to-day to perform.

How large a part and what part of each Sabbath should parents devote to their children? What are the reasons urged for the opening of motion pictures and other popular amusement places on Sunday? How far are these reasons sound? What are the churches in your community doing to attract and re-create the classes in harmony with Jesus' teachings regarding the Sabbath? How can the masses be led to seek the higher forms of social and spiritual re-creation?

*Subjects for Further Study.*

- (1) For what reason did the Pharisees charge Jesus with being a drunkard and a glutton?
- (2) How would our Puritan forefathers have regarded Jesus' attitude toward popular amusements?
- (3) What is the modern psychological attitude toward play and recreation? (*Patrick, The Psychology of Relaxation.*)
- (4) What is the scientific estimate of the physical and moral effects of dancing? (*Moxcey, Girlhood and Character*, pp. 230-233.)
- (5) What is the history and what are the aims and methods of the Boy Scout movement? (*Richardson and Loomis, The Boy Scout Movement Applied by the Church.*)
- (6) Why are the immoral effects of the melodrama, farce, and vaudeville far greater than the regular drama? (*Edwards, Popular Amusements.*)
- (7) What significant facts have been brought out by recreation surveys such as have been carried through in Detroit, Michigan, and Providence, Rhode Island?
- (8) Prepare a program for the use of the Sabbath in your home, in your church, and in your community that will accord with Jesus' interpretation of the significance of the day.

---

## CHAPTER VIII.

### THE FAMILY AND BELOVED COMMUNITY.

*Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*, pp. 241-251.  
Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 248-283.

Follett, *The New State*, pp. 204-226.

Certain Pharisees came to Jesus and to test him asked, "Has a man the right to divorce his wife?" He answered, "What did Moses command you?" They said, "Moses permitted a man to draw up a notice of separation and so to divorce her." Jesus said to them, "It is because you are hard-hearted that he wrote you that command; but from the beginning of creation God made male and female. For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and live with his wife, and the man and wife shall

become one, so that they are no longer two but one. What therefore God has joined together let no man separate."

When he went into the house his disciples asked him again concerning this, and he said to them, "Any man who divorces his wife and marries another woman commits adultery against her; and if a woman divorces her husband and marries another man, she commits adultery." *Mark 10: 2-12.*

Jesus went into a house and the crowd gathered again so that it was impossible even to eat a meal. When his relatives heard of this, they set out to get hold of him, for they said, "He is out of his mind." Standing outside, his mother and his brothers sent word to him to come out to them. He was in the midst of a seated throng when some one said to him, "Here are your mother and your brothers and sisters outside hunting for you." He answered, "Who are my mother and my brothers?" Then looking around at those who sat in a circle about him, he said, "Here are my mother and my brothers. Whoever does the will of God is my brother and sister and mother." *Mark 3: 19b-21, 31-35.* (*Shorter Bible translation.*)

## I.

### JESUS' RECOGNITION OF THE IMPORTANCE OF THE FAMILY.

The foundation and strength of the Jewish society was the family. The ancient Hebrew commonwealth was based on the local and national popular assemblies, which consisted of the elders or representatives of each family. These popular assemblies not only decided all important community and national questions and elected their leaders, but were also the schools in which citizens were trained. The welfare of society, as well as of the individual, depended, therefore, upon the stability of the family. To the family Israel's lawgivers and those practical teachers, the wise men or sages, had entrusted the education of the individual during his earlier years. By legislation and exhortation they had sought to strengthen and guard its life.

Jesus evidently accepted these fundamental natural and social principles and emphasized the importance of the family even more than they. He saw that the family is rooted in the very nature of life and that in the family the social citizen must be trained; and therefore he aimed to preserve its integrity. From the beginning to the end the development of human personality is bound up with the family. He recognized too that the foundation of the family is the marriage bond between the parents and that marriage is not a mere human convention, but a sacred relation. With his marvelous insight into realities, the natural bond of children must have seemed to him of even

greater importance than the legal bond. Though among the Jews wives were selected by the parents, it is still possible that he recognized the influence of personal attraction, love, that in our day is looked upon as the right basis of marriage, and that it was through love rather than mere legal form that God joined together man and wife. Marriage, he declares, is one of the goals of the divine purpose revealed in the natural world from the beginning, for, since human beings would cease to exist without it, man and woman are so created that they naturally enter into this sacred relation and are bound together by the closest bond known to society —that of parenthood.

In Jewish law and custom parenthood was the consummation of marriage. It is by this act of creation that man and wife are joined together by God. Jesus declared that no one had the right to sever this bond. Nature's divine law transcended even human law. On this point he did not hesitate to take issue with the authority of Moses, even though it was paramount in the Jewish world of his day. It was one of the few questions on which he laid down an absolute law. The ruling was so revolutionary and in the judgment of his disciples so extreme that they later questioned him privately; but he only reasserted his profound conviction. He declared that divorce with a view to remarriage was one of the most heinous crimes that man or woman could commit against society. Despite the customs of his day, with his keen insight he might well condemn marriage for wealth or social prestige or any motive but the God-given one of love, though his words touch only the negative side, that of divorce. In Matthew, infidelity alone is recognized as a valid basis for divorce. In the light of contemporary Jewish law the adulterer was a criminal subject to the death penalty, so that Jesus probably recognized this exception, although in the oldest record (in Mark) it was not stated.

It is profoundly significant that he who was the supreme champion of individual liberty and development and divinely charitable toward the sinner was adamant on this point. In no more striking way could he have stressed the paramount importance of the family to the individual and to society, and yet it seems clear from his whole attitude toward life that reality rather than formal law was in his mind. There are many real divorces — husband and wife living separate lives under the same roof — among legally married couples. There are

many whose hearts are wedded, whom God has called to union, but whom desires for wealth or fame or other opposing circumstances have held apart. In ignoring these facts concerning marriage modern Christian civilization has suffered its greatest losses. Homes dismembered by divorce, often because of wrong marriage, have bred our worst criminals. And yet lax divorce laws have often not brought happiness or development to the many who have resorted to them. Often their motives have not been good, but evil. It is fair to say that our present practice has proved a tragic failure. Even though in individual cases the application of Jesus' rule undoubtedly means self-denial and suffering, is it possible that in the end insistence on the true marriage or none means greater happiness and development for the individual as well as for society?

The practical significance of this ruling regarding divorce is obvious; but deeper still lies the real problem of marriage. What does Jesus mean when he speaks of those whom God has joined together? The usual reply is, "Those who in the presence of the civil or religious authorities have assumed the obligations of marriage." But the marriage conventions of Jesus' day, even more than with us, brought many together in this relation who felt no real affection and in some cases only repulsion toward each other. Did he who went to the heart of every question regard these as joined together by God? When he explained that the Mosaic divorce laws were due to the fact that they were hard-hearted, was he not referring to the false ambitions and the greed of parents as well as of the contracting parties and to the other base motives which often have separated those who truly love each other or have led to the law marriage of those who clearly were never "joined by God"? These are the marriages which fill our divorce courts. Where true love is the bond, there is no need for divorce laws. Was not the vital aim in Jesus' teachings on this subject to change men's hard-heartedness and so prevent the evil at its fountain source?

In any case the conclusions to be drawn from Jesus' words are intensely practical. Marriage is not only a divine institution, but each marriage can and should be a divine relationship if men and women will not harden their hearts but keep them responsive to the promptings of pure love. All the forces of society should be regulated with the one aim of bringing into the marriage relation those whom God has joined together.

But as Jesus added in reply to the questions of his disciples, if men have hardened their hearts and the interests of many are involved, the remedy even then may not be legal divorce, if that would involve as it often does, grievous wrong to the innocent children or parent. The interests of children and of society must be preserved, even though when innocent mistakes, rather than evil motives or hardness, have brought men and women into the false relationship of loveless marriage, and separation or divorce seems the only remedy.

How far are the divorce conditions in America due to the present belief in individualism? Why has the Protestant far more than the Roman Catholic Church failed to check legal divorce? Does the position maintained by the Roman Catholic Church protect the home? Among what classes are divorces most common?

## II.

### THE DUTIES OF HUSBANDS AND WIVES.

Jesus' strenuous teachings regarding divorce did not stand alone; they are only a part, although an exceedingly important part, of his philosophy of living. They are a corollary of the command to do to others as you would have them do to you. The type of divorce that Jesus condemns is secured that the one seeking it may remarry. It implies the motive of selfishness, not of justice. In that act the individual in order to gratify a personal desire or passion often ignores the rights and interests of the one divorced, those of the children of the first marriage if any, those of the friends and relatives, and the moral standards of our present society, which disapprove whenever it separates what God has joined together.

In a family where Jesus' principles of living are applied, divorce in order to remarry is practically impossible. The initial love between husband and wife (and without that love they would not marry) is constantly strengthened by acts of tender consideration. Each is seeking to improve the thousand opportunities that family life offers to do to the other what each would have done to himself. Nothing binds individuals more closely than doing a worthy task together, and life offers no nobler task than that of parenthood. Marriage, as Jesus

Gospels and the New Testament generally. When demoniacs applied it to Jesus it may well be in a messianic sense, and the same may be true of the trial passage before the high priest (Matt. 26. 63; cf. verse 68). But in those passages where Jesus speaks of Himself as 'the Son' and calls God 'His Father', the official messianic idea is entirely absent. He is not, that is to say, called Son of God because He is Messiah; He is Messiah because He is Son of God.

Even explanations in terms of an ethical relationship between Jesus and God are not sufficient to exhaust the full significance of the designation Son of God. Passages such as 'O my Father if it be possible...' (Matt. 26. 39) and 'Father into Thy hands...' (Luke 23. 46) may be taken as expressive of this personal ethical relationship. And the profound words of Matthew 11. 27 may be read as the climax of this ethico-religious sentiment. These Johannine-like words are not however a passing emotion in the self-consciousness of Jesus; they are the outflow of a settled conviction and a habitual mood. There is a relationship pre-supposed which is one of absolute intimacy.

The ethical relationship demands a deeper and profounder one. Thus the title Son of God is no official designation of office or no pattern sonship for discipleship, for He never became a Son. Jesus unfailingly spoke of God as 'my Father' and 'your Father' but never as 'our Father'. To say, with Harnack, that the name Son means nothing but the knowledge of God, is far from the truth. For the mind of Jesus the unclouded consciousness of an eternally unshared Sonship is the supreme reality. The ethical union implies a metaphysical one—a union of nature. Christ spoke of God as Father and Himself as Son with a 'naturalness' which indicated His moral perfection. Thus to say that Jesus was in ethical relation to God is to say that He

was in essential relation to Him. The consciousness of His own sinlessness gives Him the right to use the title without strain or stain, and thus to set Him apart from others. Between Jesus and God, indeed, all things are common. It is the filial consciousness not the messianic consciousness which is the basic fact of our Christian faith and gospel.

In John's Gospel the presentation of the Sonship of Christ has a larger place than in the Synoptics. But the essential facts are still the same. Here we find Jesus calling for faith in Himself as the Son of God (John 10. 35), and manifestly accepting the declaration of it (cf. 11. 27). It was for the purpose of establishing this faith in Him as Son of God that the Gospel itself was written (20. 31).

A new thought however is the description of the Son as 'only begotten'. The word used in 1. 14, 18; 3. 16, 18 (cf. 1 John 4. 9) for 'only begotten'—monogenes—underlines the fact that His Sonship is unique. According to Westcott the thought is centred in the personal Being of the Son and not in His generation. Christ is the One only Son, the One to whom the title belongs in a sense completely special and which distinguishes Him from the many children of God (cf. 1. 12f.). In contrast with others He is *Only* Son; the Son that never was, is, or shall be other than Son. In the Septuagint the word 'monogenes' is used to translate the Hebrew word for 'only' (jachid, cf. Judg. 11. 34); and the only begotten one is the only beloved one (cf. Gen. 22. 2, 12, 16—where the Septuagint has 'agapētos', 'beloved', for 'only'; cf. Mark 12. 6).

In his epistles John speaks of the Son with the same doctrinal overtones. As Son He was sent by the Father (1 John 4. 9, 10, 14), and to Him the Father bears witness (1 John 5. 9f). He is the true object of faith (1 John 5. 5, 10, 13) whose blood cleanses from sin

punishment are now futile. The will to do right must be within. The habit of right doing and thinking can best be learned through happy comradeship with their earliest and most beloved playmates, their parents. Wise and blessed indeed is the parent who learns the divine art of not obtruding his companionship upon sensitive and variable adolescence but who never fails to respond to those calls for help, often difficult to detect, that youth is constantly sending out while crossing the dangerous bar that divides childhood from manhood and womanhood.

To parents is entrusted the sacred task of imparting to their children the divine mysteries and responsibilities of sex. Sometimes the parent may select the fitting occasion. More often it is determined by a sudden question or a crisis in the life of the child. For that fateful moment every parent should long before have made careful and thorough preparation. When it arrives all other engagements may well be ignored, for it presents one of the supreme issues of life and to-morrow may be a lifetime too late. Usually in our overdeveloped American life this great opportunity and responsibility comes during childhood. It is far better if the child's curiosity regarding sex questions is satisfied in a clean, normal, reverential way before reaching the stormy period of early adolescence. As one wise parent prominent in the public life of the nation has recently said: "Our children must learn most of their lessons in the school of experience; we parents can simply teach them a few vital principles of life that are necessary to save them from shipwreck."

The consciousness of the co-operation of the divine Father in this most important task of life should be even a greater source of strength and assurance than it is to the ordinary Christian parent. In speaking of children Jesus also declared in a passage that we have perhaps too hastily relegated to the realm of poetry: "I tell you that their angels always behold the face of my Father in heaven" (Matt. 18: 11). In this connection he laid down the principle that is at the foundation of all the modern Christian movements that seek to conserve children and to combat child labor and all that tends to rob children of their divine birthright.

In the light of the Old Testament teachings, which Jesus simply aimed to supplement, it requires little imagination to

picture what he would have taught in detail regarding the duties of children to parents. The first twenty-five years of his life also proclaim more loudly than words the joyous duty of respect, consideration, appreciation, loyalty and co-operation. In one significant passage he voices his own high ideal of the duty of children to parents. It is in connection with his stern rebuke of the hypocritical formalism of the Pharisees (Mark 7: 6-13), who taught their disciples that a vow and the demands of the ceremonial worship took precedence over the filial obligations. With hot indignation he turned upon them: "A fine thing it is for you to set aside God's command that you may keep your own tradition! For Moses said, 'Honor your father and mother.' 'He who speaks evil of father or mother, let him surely die.' But you say, 'If a man says to his father or his mother, What I might have used to help you is consecrated to God,' you no longer allow him to do anything for his father or his mother. Thus you set aside the command of God by your traditions which you have handed down."

What other obligations in human life are more imperative than parenthood? What place should play have in family life? Did Jesus put duties to parents before duties to God, or is such an antithesis impossible? How can children best honor their parents?

#### IV.

##### MASTERS AND SERVANTS.

In many homes, especially where there are numerous children, the problem of domestic service is both vital and sinister. A certain degree of mutual dependence which will bind parents and children together by acts of helpfulness is salutary, and should be, as it is in many Christian homes, frankly recognized as a blessing. But there are definite limitations to the time and strength of the conscientious mother which make additional assistance in the home imperative. As a rule the higher the ideals of the parents for the children the more imperative is the need.

Unfortunately the stigma of servility to a certain extent still rests upon domestic service, and it has been hedged in by certain limitations which have made the implication of bondage in part a reality. For these grave problems Jesus offers a complete solution. It is as complete as it is revolutionary.

Like many of his teachings, it anticipates the trend of modern public opinion. It breathes the spirit of the perfect democracy of to-morrow rather than the incomplete democracy of to-day. At the bottom of all his philosophy lies his profound appreciation of the sanctity and potential value of each personality and the most democratic principle ever uttered: "Whoever would be great among you shall be your servant and whoever would be first among you shall be servant of all." The far-reaching effects of this principle when thoroughly applied in the home are well worthy of careful consideration. It at once exalts the despised word "servant" (derived from the Latin root meaning to serve) to the preeminent place. In the society that he founded, service is the only basis of honor and preeminence. Measured by his standard, in the home of the idle rich (if there are any such to-day) the humblest servant who faithfully serves is obviously superior to his master if the master serves not at all. Already the principles of Jesus have banished the institution of slavery from the earth, and as soon as they are fully accepted and applied will forever remove the stigma from domestic service and from all other useful work. We will then all become servants in one capacity or another. The relative pre-eminence of master and servant will depend simply upon the quantity, quality, and fidelity of their respective services to society. A recent play by Charles Rann Kennedy, "The Servant in the House," has marvelously dramatized this real truth.

When both mistress and servant are eager to serve each other, the Christian spirit of co-operation will quickly dispel all class antagonisms. Servants will be transformed. The schedule, as well as the architecture, of many a Christian home to-day is arranged so as to conserve the happiness and interests of those who serve with their hands as well as those who serve with their brains. If Jesus' principles of living are thoroughly applied, the domestic is the simplest of our industrial problems, for the home offers the greatest opportunities for constructive workmanship of the most enduring type, since it is far nobler to develop human beings than machines.

Why do most manual laborers avoid domestic service? What are the reasons, if any, why servants in the home should have fewer hours for recreation than industrial employees? What can be done to promote the social life of domestic helpers?

## V.

## THE REHABILITATION OF THE HOME.

The glory and strength of our pioneer days in America, as well as in early Israel, was the home. The descendants of those homes are to-day among the most efficient leaders in our modern civilization; but we cannot expect that they alone will be able to meet the rigorous demands of the new age. The new leaders must be bred in modern homes. The preservation or rehabilitation of the home is therefore in many ways the most vital need of our new civilization.

The rehabilitation of the home is very generally necessary because during the past century it has been subjected to many disintegrating influences. These must be clearly understood before they can be overcome or eliminated. Chief among them are the insufficient and improper housing conditions that have often resulted from our modern industrialism. Great masses, on a low wage and ignorant of the principles of domestic science, are often crowded together in the least desirable residence sections of our manufacturing cities. In many cases a large family lives in one or two squalid rooms in a huge tenement house that opens from an equally crowded street or alley. Under these conditions no real home can be created. Children reared in such environment lack nearly everything which a home should give them: proper shelter, nutrition, parental care, opportunities for play and recreation, and inspiration in forming right physical, mental and moral habits.

Fortunately the fact is gradually dawning upon enlightened employers and citizens that society, as well as individuals, is in part responsible for these conditions. Improved tenement laws, the movement for better housing, instruction in domestic economics, the popular demand that all manual workers receive a wage adequate for fit support, and similar reforms not only illustrate the way the good Samaritan would to-day go about his task of proving himself a neighbor, but are also absolutely essential if the modern home is to be rehabilitated.

Long hours of labor and especially of female and child labor still further rob childhood of its divine rights. Efficient parenthood calls for time, opportunity and the highest physical and spiritual vigor. The demands for shorter hours of work

and for the restriction of female and child labor, both happily meeting general recognition, are more than a plea for the individual directly involved — they are the necessary step in the rehabilitation of the home which is the corner-stone of our civilization.

Among brain workers the peril of long hours of labor is even more insidious. To the long business and professional hours are added those spent in equally absorbing work for civic, social and church organizations, with the result that the ambitious and conscientious but misguided parents, for lack of time and energy, make a tragic failure of their main task in life. Unfortunately the parents who are sitting in committees considering how they may save the children of the poor of Russia or Armenia, while their own children grow up potential criminals for lack of parental direction and companionship, are not limited to the comic papers. To them may well be applied Jesus' stern denunciation of those who neglect to give to the members of their own family what they vitally need, and then excuse their crime with the plea that their wealth is consecrated to God and must be turned over to some public institution (Mark 7: 6-13). When the home is given the place in our modern thought that Jesus gave it, this popular but specious type of sin will disappear, and we shall also have fewer but more efficient social organizations.

Divorce and the social evil both strike blows at the home. In a land where one out of every thirteen marriages results in divorce, the number of ruined homes is appalling. It is obvious that education in the meaning and responsibilities of marriage must have a far larger place in our modern civilization. The public school, the church and the press must all be led to do their part in this education which is essential to the rehabilitation of the home.

Even more insidious and deadly than divorce is the social evil, for it strikes a blow not only at the purity of the home, but at the physical, mental and moral health of the children, who rightly occupy the center of the stage in Christian family life. The time is ripe for a world-wide campaign for moral sanitation and education which will check the ravages of this evil, far more destructive than the bubonic plague, and will leave the home free to develop in accord with God's good purpose. The abolition of the double standard for man and woman and the humane care and the scientific methods now being adopted

to reclaim the victims of not only their own weakness but also of society's false standards, are some of the practical ways in which Jesus' example and teachings are influencing modern life.

Another evil that is undermining the home is the tendency of many parents to leave the religious as well as the intellectual training of their children to church and state. Many are unacquainted with that unique repository of social, ethical and religious truth — the Bible. Many more, because of inherited traditions or inertia, are unfamiliar with the modern methods of studying and interpreting it, and so find themselves unable to speak the language that their children have learned in public and church schools. They have also failed to avail themselves of the practical results of the modern scientific study of childhood and of the problems peculiar to parenthood, so that when they face their greatest responsibility and opportunity they are unable to qualify. Parenthood in the twentieth century is a profession, not a mere incident, and the sooner this fact is clearly recognized the sooner the home will be rehabilitated.

Parents have responsibilities that they can delegate to no one else. Through the eyes of their own experience and characteristics they alone can fully understand the potential strength and weakness of their children and teach them how to overcome the evil with the good. The parents occupy an absolutely unique vantage point from which to establish the ideals, the standards, the habits, and the characters of the highly impressionable guests who at their invitation have come to live in their home.

As in olden days, the parents are the high priests in the home. They can neglect their task and thereby merit the stinging censure that Jesus directed against the degenerate high priests of his nation; but they cannot abdicate. No nurse or teacher can help the child to recognize the good purpose in the universe and to trust and co-operate with the Heavenly Father as can the parent, if he is properly trained. The appreciation of the divine worshipship, if but aroused, grows naturally in the home into the habits of true, if not of formal worship. The wise parent will, like the ancients, link closely together true worship and recreation and will dramatize in all the religious life of the family the fact that Jesus' way of living is the way of joy and happiness.

If Jesus' principles are to gain universal acceptance, the

home must be rehabilitated, and it can be rehabilitated only as his principles are simply and naturally taught and applied in the family.

What can the public school contribute to rehabilitating the home? What can the church do and through what agencies? How can we educate youth so that there will be a clear appreciation of the significance and responsibilities of marriage?

## VI.

### THE BELOVED COMMUNITY.

Jesus' entire social theory was rooted in the family. His social program may be described in a word as a deliberate and systematic endeavor to carry the ideals of the family into every community and ultimately throughout the world, until all mankind should recognize the obligations and share the joys of common fatherhood and brotherhood. Supremely loyal though Jesus was to all his filial obligations, it must be remembered that when he reached full maturity, he turned a deaf ear to the demand of his kinsmen that he return home, and henceforth devoted himself wholly to the service of the larger brotherhood. Upon his disciples he placed the same obligation. "Any one who loves father or mother more than me is not worthy of me, and any one who loves son or daughter more than me is not worthy of me. Any one who does not take up his cross and follow where I lead is not worthy of me. He who finds his life shall lose it, and he who loses his life for my sake shall find it."

Here Jesus was evidently using an oriental hyperbole which still survives in the Near East, but he did so in order to emphasize a most important truth. Loyalty to one's self is natural to childhood. Even greed and selfishness are then normal. As the child matures, however, he develops loyalty to family, and this loyalty is a vast advance over selfishness. But the law of life is, as Jesus dramatically declared, an ever-widening circle of loyalties. The boy's intense loyalty to his gang or the girl's to her set represents a widening circle which in later youth expands into loyalty to the club or fraternity or church. Larger loyalties embrace the lesser. The youth who

is loyal to his church is not less but more loyal to himself and to his family. But whenever the expression of this loyalty is arrested, the individual ceases to develop and remains a child or youth in social stature.

Jesus sought to lead his followers on to the full stature of the perfect man and woman. Therefore he set before them the ideal of the beloved community. It included all who, like themselves, were intent upon doing the will of God. These Jesus implied were not only his but their brothers and sisters and mothers. This beloved community was the larger family, capable through their united efforts of unlimited expansion, to which he directed their supreme devotion and loyalty. Jesus sought to build up about each individual an eager, kindly, fraternal group, ever growing until it included all members of the local community. In this each found not only friendship, sympathy and help but ample opportunity for self-expression and growth through service. This was the only type of church that Jesus ever founded. It was the family ideal expanded until it included all members of the local community who were responsive to the feelings of brotherhood and then expanded again until it bound together, through common loyalties, all men of all races who accepted Jesus' principles of living. Like a mother bird, he longed to gather all of the scattered sons of Abraham under his enfolding wings. The Gospel of John also reminds us that the great Shepherd had sheep not of the Jewish fold under his care.

Why did Jesus' strenuous demands upon his followers not lead them to abandon or neglect their families? How far were narrow national and racial loyalties responsible for the Great War? In what way can modern churches approximate most nearly to Jesus' ideal of the beloved community.

#### *Subjects for Further Study.*

- (1) What work is being done in America to combat the divorce evil?
- (2) How would you as a parent seek to make clear to your child the facts of sex? (Cf. Richardson, *Sex Culture Talk with Young Men.*)
- (3) What more can the church do to bring youth together under conditions that will lead to happy rather than unfortunate marriages? What are the chief causes of the declining birth rate in most modern countries? What are the advantages and disadvantages of birth control?

(4) What are the best books to put in the hands of young and inexperienced parents? (Cf. Forbush, *Child Study and Child Training*; Dawson, *The Child and His Religion*; Moxcey, *Girlhood and Character*; Hartshorne, *Boyhood and Character*; Elizabeth Grinnel, *How John and I Brought Up the Child*; Lofthouse, *Ethics and the Family*; Jewett, *The Next Generation*.)

(5) Why do families decline and die out?

(6) Picture a day in the life of the beloved community that Jesus established at Capernaum.

## CHAPTER IX.

### THE CITIZEN AND THE STATE.

#### *Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*, pp. 252-266.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 284-309.

Follett, *The New State*, pp. 227-257.

Then the King will say to those on his right, "Come, you whom my Father has commended, enter into possession of the kingdom prepared for you since the creation of the world; for I was hungry and you gave me food, I was thirsty and you gave me drink, I was a stranger and you welcomed me, I was naked and you clothed me, I was sick and you cared for me, I was in prison and you came to me." *Matt. 25: 34-36.*

"Truly, inasmuch as you have done it even to the least of these my brothers, you have done it to me." *Matt. 25: 40.*

You know that those who are regarded as rulers in foreign countries lord it over their subjects, and their great men exercise authority over them; but it is not so among you. Whoever wishes to be great among you shall serve you, and whoever wishes to be first among you shall be of service to all. For the Son of Man did not come to be served but to be of service to others, and to give his life in order to gain freedom for many. *Mark 10: 42-45.*

You have heard the saying, "An eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth," yet I say to you, do not resent an injury; but to him who strikes you on the right cheek turn the other also. If any one wishes to sue you and to take away your coat, let him have your outer coat also. Whoever forces you to go one mile, go with him two miles. Give to him who asks of you, and turn away from no one who wishes to borrow from you. *Matt. 5: 38-42.*

Therefore, whatsoever you wish that men should do to you, do even so to them; this is the summing up of the law and the prophets. *Matt. 7: 12.*

The high priests sent to Jesus some of the Pharisees and certain of Herod's supporters to entangle him with questions. They came to him and said, "Teacher, we know that you are truthful and fearless, for you defer to no one but faithfully teach the way in which God wishes men to live. Is it right to pay taxes to Cæsar, or is it not? Shall we pay or shall we not pay?" But knowing their hypocrisy, Jesus replied, "Why do you try to entrap me? Bring me a coin and let me see it." And when they

brought him one, he asked, "Whose image and inscription are these?" They said to him, "Cæsar's." Then to their astonishment Jesus said to them, "Give to Cæsar what belongs to Cæsar, and to God what belongs to God." *Matt. 22: 15-21.*

No sound tree bears rotten fruit; neither does a rotten tree bear sound fruit; for each tree is known by its fruit. Figs are not gathered from thorns, nor grapes picked from a bramble-bush. From the good stored in his heart the good man brings forth goodness, but the evil man from his evil store brings forth evil; for the mouth speaks that with which the heart is filled. *Luke 6: 43-45.*

You are the salt of the earth; but if the salt has become tasteless, how shall it regain its strength? It is no longer fit for anything but to be thrown out and trodden under foot.

You are the light of the world. A city on a hill cannot be hidden. One does not light a candle to put it under a basket but on a stand, where it shall give light to all in the house. So let your light shine before men that they may see your good deeds and praise your heavenly Father. *Matt. 5: 13-16.* (*Shorter Bible* translation.)

## I.

### JESUS' CONCEPTION OF THE CITIZEN'S DUTIES.

It has already been noted that Jesus developed his principle of service to the community from the viewpoint of the individual. Considering the conditions under which he was living in Palestine and that his view of a redemption of humanity was primarily not political, he would naturally plan first to redeem the hearts of individuals and then through these regenerated individuals make over society. Therefore, he would in like manner approach any subject of political reformation through the local community. He would then expect that reformed local communities would gradually build over the nation and that through the regenerated nations would come a new world. It is evident, also, that under the conditions then existing in Palestine, which was largely a self-governing Jewish community under the lordship of Rome, it was unwise to attempt to exert directly any political influence, though his teachings might indirectly have great political effect.

The fundamental reason, however, for his method was doubtless a psychological one. He believed it to be the only sound method of rebuilding society, for in his mind the individual is the social unit. It seems clear, nevertheless, that Jesus had in mind also community betterment, and that he had hoped and expected that by his work in Capernaum he would succeed in making of that busy central city a type of community

which might well serve as a model for others. He chose a small group of disciples to be infused with his spirit and then by their personal efforts he planned to plant his spirit in the hearts of others throughout different parts of Palestine. Moreover, in his work of healing and teaching, and through his giving of charity and preaching brotherly love, he had hoped to build up some social organizations that would affect profoundly the life of the city. We may note from his touching and eloquent picture of the Son of Man in his glory judging the nations and separating the good from the evil as the shepherd separates the sheep from the goats, his idea of social work. The religious man was to give food and drink to the hungry and thirsty, he was to welcome the stranger, clothe the naked, care for and heal the sick, and visit those in prison. We find here comprised the chief public works of charity and helpfulness even at the present time. And when he went further than to enumerate in specific words these duties, and, in order to interpret the spirit of his teachings, added, "Inasmuch as you have done it even to the least of these my brothers, you have done it to me," we see how truly social was the entire spirit of his teachings and yet how the range of his interest as thus depicted was limited to the local community.

In other parts of his teachings we see that he expected each worthy citizen not only to care for his individual brothers, but to perform his duties to the public by the payment of taxes and the meeting of other public obligations. He clearly recognized the need of government and of rulers and the obligations that rest upon all citizens to give such rulers proper support. Naturally, under the conditions in which he was living, nothing was said about the form of government, either democratic or imperialistic. Political agitation in the modern sense of the word would be impracticable; but even worse than that, it would at that time have absolutely ruined the fundamental principles of Christianity as applied to the individual. If he were to become the Messiah, he must be the Messiah not in the old Jewish political sense of that word but in the new sense of establishing the rule of God in the hearts of individuals. The Jewish people were anticipating the coming of a Messiah who should be a temporal ruler and who should come with sword and spear to cast off the yoke of Rome and establish a temporal

kingdom. Any emphasis, therefore, upon the duty of the citizens to take a part, however small, in public affairs would have served to awaken the military spirit of selfish aggression, which he had determined, after full consideration, would be absolutely contrary to his spirit of social service which must begin in the hearts of individual citizens.

It seems evident from the account of the temptations which he had endured at the time of reflection and planning before he entered upon his life work, that he had been compelled to discuss with himself and settle in advance this most fundamental question of the nature of the new democracy of God which he was to introduce. He plainly recognized that any open political act would force him into a position of political leadership which would be absolutely fatal to the establishment of the true democracy of God. In speaking of the duties of men, therefore, he carefully avoided all reference to public political duties, but laid great emphasis upon the duty of the individual to his fellow men.

There is no reason, however, to believe that political activity in our day is in any sense contrary to the spirit of Jesus' teachings. Quite the reverse is true. If a man is to render his complete duty to his fellows, it must be not only by individual contact with those needing aid and by rendering individual justice, but also by bringing influence to bear upon the forms of social organization established in the community.

Jesus clearly recognized the need of adaptation of method to time and place. It was therefore only practical for him to establish the general principles of the rule of God on earth and to leave to his followers in succeeding generations the task of applying these principles to the circumstances and needs of their times.

How far can a preacher take an active part in politics without weakening his religious influence? Can a university teacher of politics, in the long run, render greater service to the public by becoming a leader in party politics or by confining his activities to non-partisan discussion of political principles and party issues? Why?

How far is it wise for social workers such as those in social settlements to engage in political contests? Give full reasons with illustrative experiences, if possible.

## II.

## THE AUTHORITY AND OBLIGATIONS OF RULERS.

From the accounts given in the New Testament of the efforts made by his enemies to entice Jesus into condemnation of the local government authorities and repudiation of his obligations to them, we can see how practically wise as well as politically sound were these principles that he had adopted. We have perhaps nowhere else in history a wiser or shrewder evasion of a difficult trap, combined with a direct statement of a citizen's obligations, than in his reply to the Pharisees and certain of Herod's supporters, who attempted to ensnare him into a repudiation of taxes. "Is it right to pay taxes to Cæsar or is it not? Shall we pay or shall we not pay?" Seeing their trick Jesus replied, "Why do you try to entrap me? Bring me a coin and let me see it." Then showing them the image and inscription on the coin he inquired, "Whose image and inscription are these?" When they replied "Cæsar's," it gave him his opportunity: "Give to Cæsar what belongs to Cæsar," and then he continued with his ethical and religious lesson, "and to God what belongs to God."

Titian's marvellous picture of Jesus in this discussion over taxes brings out more clearly than is found elsewhere in the history of art Jesus' intellectual keenness and practical wisdom.

The real nature, however, of the obligation of rulers in the exercise of their authority he emphasized strongly in the statement, which is backed up so well by his lifelong example, "Whoever wishes to be great among you shall serve you, and whoever wishes to be first among you shall be of service to all." There has never been any better statement than this of what has become at the present time the shibboleth of democratic government: service to the people. Present political rulers often speak of themselves as servants of the people with more or less of a hypocritical note in their accents. They hope to hoodwink the people by apparently bowing to the dominating influence that the teachings of Jesus have attained in the establishment of democratic governments, while in reality serving their own selfish ends. They must conceal their real, selfish purposes under the guise of public service.

Why are not the great masses of our people really more

competent to decide a complex political problem, like a tax or banking law, than are the members of Congress, who get the aid of scientific experts? What are the weak and the strong points of the referendum in law making? Ought the people to rule directly or through chosen representatives? Why?

### III.

#### ETHICAL STANDARDS OF GOVERNMENT.

One of the most difficult questions that all teachers of ethics and religion have had to meet from the beginning of human history is the formation of ethical standards. What is right? What is wrong? In all of the complicated affairs of life, no questions are more difficult to answer. It is easy to say that to do God's will is right, to violate God's teachings is wrong, but in the application of these principles to the complicated affairs of life, many difficulties arise. What is God's will in a specific case?

The old Jewish commandments that have formed the basis of ethical judgments in many countries are sometimes contradictory when it comes to their practical application. "Thou shalt not steal," is a definite command, but occasions sometimes arise, when if the government or even private individuals do not take property that legally belongs to others, they leave individuals or communities to die of cold or starvation, and to do so is contrary to the spirit of the command, "Thou shalt not kill." Often under the trying emergencies of the late war, when whole communities were starving and children were dying like flies, the only possible remedy for the evil lay in the taking of property of others without their consent. Extremists in literal interpretation believe that the injunction "Thou shalt not kill" is violated even when, under the authority of the state, the life of a criminal is taken, in order to protect society.

The application of the injunction, "Thou shalt not commit adultery" must vary greatly in countries where monogamy is practised as compared with countries where polygamy is legal, because legalized polygamy is not adultery in law even though it is in spirit. So it is in the practical application of many laws and ethical teachings. Is there any way by which we can determine under the varying conditions what is the absolute standard of right?

Better than anywhere else, perhaps, we find the standard fixed by Jesus in his method of interpreting the ancient Jewish laws and in his principles of living as shown throughout his life. That which on the whole benefits humanity is right; that which injures the community is wrong. We find this standard worked out specifically in his interpretation of the Hebraic law regarding the keeping of the Sabbath and in his defence of David for meeting his necessities and those of his followers by eating the showbread that had been reserved for the sole use of the priests. Throughout his life everywhere the one principle that above all others he placed in the foreground as the test of service to God and of the fulfillment of God's will is service to one's fellow men. This is Jesus' ethical standard of governmental as well as of individual action. The Prussian doctrine that the individual exists for the state is exactly reversed in Jesus' conception of the democracy of God. The state exists for the good of the citizens; and the citizen's obligation to the government arises because the government is the agent or committee of the citizens to promote their own welfare. The state is all of us organized politically to promote our own welfare through our government made up of our officials, who are our agents.

Show that kings hold their positions by the will of their subjects. Under what conditions may a kingdom ever be a better form of government than a republic?

What did Proudhon mean when he said, "Property is theft"? Just why is private property right?

Define theft. Distinguish between justifiable killing, manslaughter, murder.

Under what conditions, if ever, are the acts legally defined as theft, adultery, murder, morally right? Distinguish clearly between God's law and man's law; between sin and crime.

#### IV.

##### THE DOCTRINE OF NON-RESENTMENT.

The spirit of devotion to the welfare of the community is the key to the interpretation of many of the statements of Jesus which have often puzzled good men to whom his teachings

have seemed impracticable. The command, "Do not resent an injury, but to him who strikes you on the right cheek turn the other also," has seemed most unwise as a principle of general application. So also the assertion, "Give to him who asks of you and turn away from no one who wishes to borrow from you," has seemed likewise impossible. Viewed, however, in the light of social welfare and of the training of the individual, these commands are not so difficult.

As the practical means of keeping one's own spirit calm and the master of circumstances, it is always unwise to lose one's temper or permit it to become uncontrollable. The injunction does not mean that one should not protect himself against aggression which would be harmful to the community; it means that one should in a reasonable spirit, without resentment, measure the significance of an angry blow and deal with it accordingly. The spirit of revenge is to be overcome. It may very well be, in fact as a matter of experience frequently, if not usually, that the best way to quiet anger is not to be angry in return, but to meet anger with cool self-control and to remove the anger by removing any possible cause for it.

The interpretation in the same spirit of the injunction, "Give liberally and loan freely," shows the wisdom of the advice under many circumstances. One of the chief advantages, for example, that has been claimed for the new federal reserve law in our monetary system is that it provides a means for extending credit in times of crisis much more liberally than would otherwise be safe. Likewise in the extending of credit or giving of charity in private cases, the man who gives skimpingly under the pressure of public opinion neither benefits himself nor meets the spiritual need of the recipient. He retains his own stingy spirit and humiliates unnecessarily and unwisely the one to whom he gives; whereas, the man who gives wholeheartedly in time of need not only gets the happiness of the truly generous, but awakens in the mind of the recipient a feeling of gratitude that is beneficial both to him and to the community. The only rational method of interpreting special statements is to note the circumstances under which they were uttered and to explain them in accordance with the spirit of all of Jesus' teachings.

The chief passage on which has been based the so-called doctrine of non-resistance is the sentence just quoted, "Do not

resent an injury," and perhaps the best illustration in the New Testament of the true spirit of charity is the parable of the good Samaritan. Jesus, himself, as we know, condemned in unmeasured terms the hypocrisy, the stinginess, and the cruelty of the scribes and Pharisees. Can there likewise be any doubt as to the true spirit of the good Samaritan regarding the showing of mercy? If we may imagine that the good Samaritan had appeared on the road from Jerusalem to Jericho a few minutes earlier when the struggle was still going on between the robbers and their victim, can we believe that he would have stood idly by without resenting or resisting the acts of the robbers? We may imagine that the priest would have excused himself by saying that it was not becoming for one of his profession to mingle in a public brawl and that he would have passed by on the other side. So with the selfish Levite. But the good Samaritan! In an instant he would have been in the midst of the fight giving blows in return for those suffered, defending the victim against the robbers; and even if he too had been overcome and left beaten, half dead, by the wayside with his fellow, we can imagine that his loyal public spirit would not have permitted him to regret his acts. Rather would he have regretted only his failure to relieve his fellow sufferer; and these two, in the fellowship of common suffering and of a common nobility of spirit, would not have repented of their resistance. They would have regretted only that their resistance had not been successful, and would have rejoiced that the evil was no greater. And their feelings would not have been contrary to the spirit of Jesus' teachings.

Distinguish between resistance to a law and treason. What do you understand by righteous indignation? Explain how a man is justified — if he is — in obeying or in disobeying a law of the state which he thinks unwise, as a bad tax law, or wrong, as the fugitive slave act.

## V.

### THE OBLIGATIONS OF STATE TO STATE.

There has been much blind abstract reasoning regarding the doctrine of sovereignty in the state and regarding the nature of the state. If we attempt to look at these questions simply

and directly, in the light of our everyday experience, we shall see the spirit of social and political organization as it was interpreted by Jesus.

We must consider the state as simply all of us organized primarily for the business of government. In the organization of all of us we have agreed by some means upon a committee to carry out our joint will. This committee we call our government. The act of the state accordingly is the expression of the will of the citizens of the state, our will; and this will can be expressed in no other way than through the government. We must recognize the fact that masses of men, even when well organized, can act only slowly. It may be that for the time being our committee men, who are our chosen representatives in government, will misrepresent our views, and we must get along until we can choose their successors before our will can be fully expressed. In the end, however, if our state is really an organization of the type that Jesus had in mind when he was planning a democracy of God, it is certain that the standard of political morality and the standard of social morality of any state will accord with the political and social morality of the mass of individuals of which it is composed.

The autocratic idea of the state differs materially from the Christian idea of the state as represented in the spirit of the teachings of Jesus. In the autocracy a few men do the thinking and the planning for the entire community, while the masses under their direction carry out the will of these few. This plan from certain points of view has its advantages. In this way promptness of action is assured so long as the masses are obedient. In many cases greater efficiency of action is secured within a brief period of time than would be possible in any democracy.

The result of the Great War, however, shows that in the end where principles of right are at stake, when time has been taken for the minds and hearts of the individual citizens to be aroused and for their wills to reach a decision, the efficiency of democracy is far greater than the more mechanical efficiency of autocracy.

With this conception of the state, we may see that in the light of the teachings of Jesus the obligation of state to state should be substantially that of individual to individual. That would be the natural and inevitable meaning of carrying the

principles of Jesus into that realm. The welfare of the community is the criterion of judgment of right and wrong for the individual. The welfare first of the individual citizens should be the criterion of judgment and the goal of action of the government of each separate state in its own internal affairs. In external affairs the welfare of the nations at large, of the world as a whole, should be the purpose of every state and its standard for measuring the right and wrong of its action. This does not mean that a state should not protect its own rights. Indeed, it cannot well promote the welfare of humanity if it does not maintain its own rights and strength. But the welfare of all nations is the chief basis of international action for determining questions of peace and war. No one can exaggerate the horrors of war. And yet, looking ahead to the distant future and considering the welfare of not any one nation but of the world at large, we may easily see that a war that is not one of aggression, but one fought to uphold the principles of justice, to overthrow autocracy and to bring other nations of the world into the commonwealth of God, may be a war conducted absolutely in the spirit of the Prince of Peace.

In what way is the interest of the United States as a whole promoted or lessened by the State of New York keeping in mind primarily its own interest while considering always its duty to the nation? Consider whether a man of unusual business ability serves the community best by giving away all his property, or by conducting his business carefully, increasing production and then using a part of his income for building his business and part for direct public service.

How far did King Albert of Belgium carry out the principles given above in counseling resistance to Germany's demands at the beginning of the World War?

## VI.

### THE CHRISTIAN PROGRAM FOR WORLD PEACE.

Throughout all history there have been advocates of a world peace, and numerous have been the plans for its attainment through a league of nations. In the days of ancient Greece we find the Amphictyonic Council. Even the execrated

Congress of Vienna thought that it evolved a plan for a world peace. The great German philosopher, Immanuel Kant, formulated his plan for a league to prevent wars, and numerous other like attempts have been made.

During the Great War men's minds had been filled and inspired with the hope that a repetition of its horrors might be prevented for all time. The attempt has again been made to form a league of nations to attain this end. Many men with hopeful vision have thought that the field of a nation's activities is too narrow for their plans and that it is now possible to usher in a régime of cosmopolitanism. Some men apparently already feel that the thought of citizenship in a state is too narrow and that one should think of himself primarily as a citizen of the world state. Others think such views are unpractical and even wrong.

In what way does Jesus' marvellous insight into human nature throw light upon this question? What suggestions do his principles of society give for the solution of this most difficult problem?

As we have seen, the unit of thinking is the individual and the unit of action in the community is primarily the individual man. As the community is bettered by the building over of the natures of the individuals, eventually a nation may become a new and better type of nation. So likewise in accordance with the spirit of Jesus' teachings the great world federation of states must be built up step by step. As each nation, through its individual members expressing their will through its government, accepts and acts in the spirit of Jesus in its effort to promote the welfare of other nations and of the world, there gradually will be built up associations of nations, democratic in form and in the spirit of the democracy of God. As this spirit gradually transforms nation after nation, there will slowly arise the world state that will be in reality the democracy of God on earth.

When we consider the character of the acts of the different nations during the past decade, when we consider the spirit with which the representatives of the governments of different nations conducted themselves at the Peace Conference, is it possible to hope that as yet we have attained to this best world state? In the light of the same conclusions, is it too much to hope that there is already in existence in at least

some of the nations enough of the unselfish spirit of Jesus to enable them to form a league of nations that shall be the beginning of this world state? If we follow the teachings of Jesus, is it as yet too early for individuals to attempt to act in a cosmopolitan way? With a vision of universal brotherhood, they must look forward to an all-embracing democracy. All great social movements require time, since they involve the changing of the minds and hearts and wills of the many; but gradually though slowly, through the growth of this league of democracies there will arise the world state, a universal brotherhood which Jesus characterized as the democracy of God.

It cannot be forgotten, however, as a principle both of growth and of permanent activity, that the democracy of God is within you; it is and must forever remain in the hearts of individual citizens.

When the United States buys a ship from Brazil, what individuals act? What does each one do? How much personal discretion does he exercise? In how far is this method in accordance with Jesus' methods? Which official affects most your personal interests, the tax assessor, the governor of your state, or the Secretary of State of the United States?

*Subjects for Further Study.*

- (1) Compare the views of Aristotle regarding private property with those of Proudhon.
- (2) Examine carefully the New Testament teachings regarding duties of rulers and duties to rulers.
- (3) Compare the political power of the President of the United States with that of the Prime Minister of Great Britain.
- (4) Compare the Paris Conference's draft of the League of Nations with Immanuel Kant's Plan for Perpetual Peace; with the plans of the Congress of Vienna.

## CHAPTER X. THE RULE OF GOD.

*Parallel Readings.*

- Kent, *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*, pp. 267-280.  
 Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 313-355.  
 Follett, *The New State*, pp. 258-295.

Asked by the Pharisees when the rule of God would come, Jesus answered, "The rule of God will not come in visible form, nor will people say, 'Look, it is here,' or, 'It is there'; for the rule of God is within you." *Luke 17: 20, 21.*

To his disciples he gave this illustration: "The rule of Heaven is like a grain of mustard-seed which a man sows in his field. It is the smallest of all seeds, yet it grows up to be the largest of plants and becomes a tree, so that the wild birds come and perch on its branches." — *Matt. 13: 31, 32.*

And again he said, "To what shall I liken the rule of God? It is like yeast which a woman took and hid in three pecks of flour until the whole had risen." *Matt. 13: 33.*

He said also, "It is with the rule of God as with a man who sows seed in the ground, and sleeps by night and rises by day, while the seed sprouts and grows up, he knows not how. The ground bears crops of itself, first a blade, then an ear, then full grain in the ear." *Mark 4: 26-28.* (Shorter Bible translation.)

## I.

### CURRENT JEWISH IDEAS OF THE RULE OF GOD.

Among all the nations of antiquity the Hebrews were the first to develop a thoroughly democratic theory of government. From the days when their forefathers broke away from the grinding political and industrial despotism of Egypt, their history was one long struggle to maintain "the rule of the people, by the people, for the people."

Against foreign invaders and conquerors and against their own tyrannically minded rulers, such as Solomon and Ahab, they stubbornly asserted their convictions, with the result that they built up a commonwealth which was not a kingdom but in every vital respect a democracy. The words translated in our King James version of the Bible, "King" and "Kingdom," come from a root meaning *to counsel*. In original meaning and as defined in the history of the Hebrew commonwealth, these current translations are unjustified and misleading. "Democracy" is a far more exact modern equivalent of the Hebrew and Aramaic words which we have hitherto unthinkingly translated "Kingdom." All the ardent hopes that in the minds of Jesus' contemporaries gathered about the popular slogan, the rule or democracy of God, were a protest against the prevailing despotism. It was a term redolent with memories of struggle and self-sacrificing devotion. In Jewish circles it still had unlimited power to arouse the passions of resentment and hate, of loyalty and self-sacrifice. It was at the same time a protest, an ideal and a social program. But the meaning was

not the same to all. In the diverse groups in Judaism it had very different meanings.

To the hot-headed Zealots from whose ranks Jesus enlisted one of his followers, it represented their hopes of the re-establishment of a Jewish state akin to that founded by David at Jerusalem in the early days. It meant the overthrow of the autocratic Roman Empire, the subjugation of the heathen, and the rule of mankind by the Jewish race. This interpretation was not only material and narrowly nationalistic, but it imperilled the very existence of the Jewish nation, as the tragic events of 68 to 70 A.D. demonstrated; for then the Zealots gained the ascendancy, and as a result the Jewish state went down in ruin.

To the educated Pharisees and the majority of the Jews of Palestine who followed their religious leadership, the rule of God was interpreted more spiritually. It was to be instituted not by fire and the sword but by miraculous means. As predicted in Daniel 2: 44, the God of heaven was expected to destroy the heathen kingdoms and to establish on an enduring basis the universal rule of his chosen people. They believed that the pious dead would rise again to life, to join with the righteous on earth in an era of peace and good will. Signs and portents in the heavens were to herald the beginning of this new age. The promised Messianic ruler was to be suddenly revealed and establish his rule throughout the world.

The picture of God's just and merciful rule presented in certain of the Psalms (2-9, 29, 47, 95-100), in which he alone was exalted and in which all nations freely shared, was almost forgotten by Jesus' contemporaries. Forgotten also, except by certain inspired prophets like Hillel and John the Baptist, were the teachings of Isaiah and Jeremiah and the great prophet who wrote Isaiah 40-55, that the divine purpose in human history could be realized only by the patient, self-sacrificing co-operation of his people; that justice and mercy were the only foundation on which an enduring social order could be founded; and that it was more important and more glorious to serve than to rule. Like the Germans before the Great War, impelled by their iridescent dream of Pan-Germanism, the vast majority of the Jews of the first Christian century were following a will-o'-the-wisp which was leading them far from the path of duty and of progress.

How did the aspirations of the majority of the Jews in Jesus' day differ from those of the Pan-Germanists in 1913? How do you explain the growth of such unethical and selfish national aspirations? Why is national self-seeking more insidious and deadly than individual selfishness? What form does this peril take in America?

## II.

### JESUS' INTERPRETATION OF THE RULE OF GOD.

From earliest youth Jesus had been familiar with the popular hopes of his race. In the book of Daniel and the latter part of Zechariah he found them incorporated in the sacred writings. The atmosphere of Palestine was so surcharged with them that they have found a place even in the later records of his teachings. What was his interpretation of the kinetic phrase, rule or democracy of God? Widely different have been the modern answers to this vital question. The brilliant French savant, Renan, saw in Jesus simply the devoted fanatic enraptured and lured on to his ruin by these impracticable dreams. Conservative interpreters, who ignore the historical analyses of the gospel records, find in him a remarkable combination of the apocalyptic dreamer and the practical social and spiritual teacher. The critical historical student is introduced in the oldest gospel records to a practical religious leader and organizer, who stood squarely on the realities of life and spent his short years and his life-blood in silently combating the wrong popular interpretations of the prophetic ideal of the rule of God by giving to it a deeper ethical, social and spiritual meaning. He too divested it of all its narrow nationalistic associations and made it a working program for every individual and therefore for the human race.

Nowhere does Jesus attempt to define the rule of God. The meaning and historic associations of the pregnant phrase proclaimed to every thoughtful Jew its essential democracy. Jesus did, however, by a large number of illustrations and comparisons, make clear its real character, and this method was far more effective than abstract definition. Its democracy he illustrated by the story of the man who invited to his feast not only the rich and cultured, but also the poor, the crippled, the blind, the lame, and even the homeless outcasts that could

be gathered along any oriental highway (Luke 14: 1a, 15b-24). Thus with one sweeping statement he freed the old prophetic ideal from all the race and class prejudice and privilege that had gathered about it, and threw wide open the door to every human being of every race and faith.

In the same incisive way he cleansed the ideal of the gross materialism that had almost wholly obscured its real character. In answer to a question asked by a Pharisee which betrayed his material and temporal conception of it, Jesus declared in clearest terms: "The rule of God will not come in visible form, nor will people say, 'Look, it is here,' or, 'It is there,' for the rule of God is within you." Thus the spectacular Pharisaic expectations of a final trumpet blast, of divided heavens, of falling stars and of the bodies of the dead rising from the opened graves were flung aside by this clear-eyed Son of Reality. In imagination one can hear the gasp of the questioning Pharisee. Gone are all the dramatic trappings with which he had decked and in the end concealed this divine plan. In the searchlight of Jesus' interpretation it stood forth in its practical simplicity. He taught that the rule of God is established here and now in the heart of every man who recognizes God's good purpose working out in all creation and who is ready to co-operate with his divine Friend and Father in perfecting that purpose in his own soul, in his family, in his community, and in the life of humanity.

How far is Jesus' teaching regarding what is popularly called the "Kingdom of God" clearly understood by the average Christian to-day? By those outside the church? What are the reasons for the prevailing vagueness? To what extent is the tendency to externalize and materialize the rule of God still at work to-day? How does the meaning of "Thy will be done" in the Lord's prayer differ from that of "Thy rule come?"

### III.

#### THE GROWTH OF THE RULE OF GOD.

It has already been noted that Jesus placed emphasis upon the individual, his originality, his worth, his power to exercise influence over others. In the parable of the mustard seeds and of the leaven we find clearly depicted the method by which

Jesus expected this rule to be extended. He himself was infused with the spirit of God. He associated with himself his twelve interested followers, believing that they through him would be imbued with the same thought and the same spirit. Each of them in turn would come into contact with other individuals and fill them with the same thought and same spirit. Thus by individual touch the thoughts and the spirit of God would gradually, little by little, spread throughout the world until the entire world would be filled. The parable of the leavened bread in which the particles of yeast have each gradually inoculated the others until the whole has been leavened is perhaps the most accurate illustration of Jesus' process of social reform.

In ancient Greece, Socrates had much the same plan. He spent his time in the market place giving forth his ideas by precept, and by his keen questioning arousing in the minds, especially of the young men, the ambition to think for themselves and to work out the problems of life. Each one of them Socrates felt would become a center of activity for the enlightenment of the people.

Jesus' method of leaving his followers to apply the teachings left them free to adopt any form of social action which does not violate his principles. Of course, the methods of spreading ideas and of exerting influence upon others will change with the times. In the ancient days there was, relatively speaking, little traveling of individuals from place to place. In consequence, the spreading of ideas was much less rapid than now; but even then Jesus sent his disciples throughout the neighboring country in order that his ideas might be more rapidly spread abroad; and his chief missionary follower, Paul, undertook great journeys throughout a large part of the Roman world in order that all parts might learn the good news.

The cultivation of public opinion by sermons and discussions can be more thoroughly and rapidly followed up at the present time through the press, through the use of moving pictures, and through all the other methods of propaganda, direct and indirect, that were carefully worked out by the different governments at the time of the Great War.

We think of education primarily in connection with the schools, and of course it is true that the best time for inculcating, especially moral lessons and noble practices of life, is when

people are young. The lessons can then be more thoroughly taught and children's minds are much less distracted by competing interests.

At the present time, however, the plans and the practice of education are by no means limited to children. Every political campaign, every great social movement is an educational process, and the growth of the democracy of God likewise must be through such an educational process. Inasmuch as the spirit of Jesus fills one with the desire of communicating the glad tidings to others in order that they also may be benefited, each one who is truly Christian will feel the responsibility of undertaking to spread the good news by every means within his power. The responsibility does not differ with a man's trade or profession. Only the methods of approach will differ. The responsibility rests upon the merchant, the farmer, the railroad man, as much as upon the preacher, the teacher, and the editor. It is a question of employing to the best advantage the means that are in one's possession to secure the rapid growth of the democracy of God.

How can a shoemaker or a blacksmith preach the gospel of Jesus to his customers to the utmost of his ability? What effect has the printing press had on the power of personal appeal? What at present is the personal influence of the salesman or of the orator or of the business organizer?

#### IV.

##### CONDITIONS OF PARTICIPATION IN THE RULE OF GOD.

Every association consisting of members has certain conditions for admission to membership. Even an all-inclusive organization like the state has such conditions. A man must be born within the territory, or after a period of residence he must pass certain examinations or give proof of the possession of certain qualifications before he is admitted to participate in the privileges of citizenship or is held responsible for its duties. For most associations having a specific purpose, whether the purpose be pleasure or protection or profit or religion, people are required to make declaration of their belief and to undertake certain responsibilities before they are admitted. Jesus,

likewise, in undertaking the conquest of the world by the spreading of his ideas doubtless contemplated the organization of a great society made up of his followers. Believing as he did in the overwhelming power of ideas as affecting character, he placed emphasis upon a change of heart, a regeneration through beliefs, and laid little stress upon the form of organization.

The elaborate constitution of our religious organizations, our churches, and the later developments brought about through the advantages of organization to accomplish results, have been attended with the same dangers that accompany all organizations for specific purposes, such as political parties or temperance societies or co-operative insurance companies or trade unions. There is always a danger that the organization will be diverted from being a means to promote certain ideas into becoming an end in itself. The leaders, holding positions of influence and often of profit, naturally wish to retain their control. Often, too, strong individuals having certain views of their own will graft their personal views upon the fundamental principles for which the organization was made, and in consequence the whole organization will be shunted on to new lines. The Republican party and the Democratic party in our own country have both retained their organization even when the fundamental principles of their platforms have been modified, or at times even reversed. So likewise in the churches we find that certain denominations have emphasized forms of baptism or of other cherished ordinances, or have placed supreme stress upon a hierarchical organization. These things have sometimes diverted the individual members from the real spirit with which Jesus started the organization. His injunction was simply, "Follow me;" his thought, that each individual would feel his spirit and would devote himself unselfishly in whatever way seemed to him best for the carrying out of God's will in human society. Naturally there is no condemnation for an individual who helps build an organization to carry out Jesus' ideas, but there is always danger that an organization will be diverted from its principles, and it is the duty of its members constantly to keep in mind the principles for which the organization is built.

Jesus laid down for his disciples the conditions of absolute devotion to the carrying out of his ideas. A man must be ready

to abandon father and mother, wife and children, and he must make whatever sacrifices of wealth or position or even family duties that are necessary to the more imperative duty of carrying out God's will. That means he must invariably follow his own conscience; he must always do what at the moment he believes to be his duty. This primarily is the condition of participation in the democracy of God.

Just what constitutes a "call" to service of any kind? In what ways may we determine God's will regarding our daily duties? Or regarding our life work?

Explain and illustrate the difficulties of applying moral principles to a merchant's business.

## V.

### THE INDIVIDUAL'S PART IN THIS RULE.

Jesus looked upon the individual as the basis of his organization. There are various ways in which he may play his part. He may work publicly in the special field of religion as a preacher of the Gospel, as a teacher in the Sunday school, or as an editor of a religious publication, or as a public lecturer on moral and religious topics.

There is no reason, however, for believing that Jesus laid emphasis upon the method of work. The chief emphasis is placed upon the spirit in which a man works. All of us have individual gifts. No two are endowed alike. One man has a special faculty for building and handling machinery, whereas he would make a failure at public teaching. He may serve God better and do more to promote the welfare of God's democracy by building and manufacturing machinery to further the work and welfare of society than by attempting to preach. If a man conducts his business as a banker absolutely in the spirit of Jesus' teachings, he will do much to promote the health, the welfare and the comfort, and to uplift the spirit of the community. In all probability he can do more for the welfare of the community by following his own work most faithfully and honestly than in any other way. Likewise a lawyer in his separate field can probably accomplish more for society by securing the righteous interpretation of law and the

promotion of justice than by attempting to preach. We should do away with the idea that any one calling is sacred. We should rather insist upon it that each individual should make his own calling sacred through the spirit in which he follows it.

Do most men choose deliberately their life work or do they drift into it? How is it possible to learn one's aptitude for a calling without testing it by experience? Is it ever desirable to change the plan of one's life work? Under what conditions?

## VI.

### THE RULE OF GOD AND THE STATE.

A good citizen is the man who in his own field of personal activity devotes himself — all that he has and all that he is — to the welfare of the community. We shall have a true republic in the sense in which Jesus spoke of the democracy of God when we have all of the thinking citizens in any community filled with public spirit.

There has been and still is a belief on the part of some that a change in our economic organization is necessary in order that we may attain the best political organization. It is argued that so long as we have a wage system and some men work in the service of others there can never be a true democracy. To attain this ideal it has been proposed that the production of all wealth be placed in the hands of the government and that individuals selected for that purpose direct all of the business affairs of a community. Thus it is thought there will be attained likewise a better type of political order. Such a plan places the great mass of the individuals in a community under the absolute direction of a few leaders as regards not only their political but also their business activities. Inasmuch as such a process has thus far in human history resulted only in the tyranny of the few over the many, it is the direct opposite of the one advocated by Jesus.

His teaching clearly implies that if to the individuals in a community is given the proper spirit of self-development for the public good, any form of business organizations or any form of political organizations may exist and still give us the democracy of God.

If under the wage system both employers and wage earners

are filled with the unselfish spirit of Jesus, and the present evils in the wage system are remedied, we shall attain justice in the industrial world just as completely as would be possible under any system of socialism. If on the other hand in a socialistic state the rulers should not have the unselfish spirit of Jesus, there would be an economic tyranny worse than any existing under the wage system. There is no reason to believe, as has been often claimed, that a change in the form of political organization would bring about so great a change in human nature that better results would be attained by adopting such a form of government. In fact the experience of humanity from the days of Aristotle to date seems to prove that in spite of the many evils that exist, the institution of private property and of a form of government working as rapidly as possible toward a democracy, even with its many difficulties, is the surest way to progress toward the real democracy of God, even though the progress is slow.

The nearest approach to a completely democratic organization in industry is found in voluntary co-operative societies, where all the workers are stockholders and furnish all the capital. This is not socialism. The state does not own the property, nor the government manage it.

The democracy of God is in no sense averse to proper discipline. The best discipline comes from the promulgation of the spirit of service, so that each individual gladly submits himself to the direction of others whenever that is necessary in order to attain the best results. A willing co-operation and a glad subordination of one's self to the direction of others for the public good secures the best discipline.

Every thoughtful man knows that great intelligence and superior organizing skill are required for the best type of organization in either business or politics. There is no reason for believing that ignorance added to ignorance will produce wisdom. The referendum of technical subjects to a general vote of the untrained masses can never attain the best results. On the other hand, the cultivation of the spirit of righteousness and honesty in all classes of the community, so that those who are not trained may select those who are trained in each special field to do their work, will secure the best results. No sensible man attempts to be his own physician, to conduct his own lawsuits, to build his own

steam-engine, or to manage his own factory, unless he is a man trained in that special field. He engages experts to do such work. So should it be in connection with government. We should have a democratic government, conducted in the spirit of Jesus in which the individual voters shall each select as their representatives the trained men in the special fields in which work is required. This type of government is in accordance with Jesus' plan of changing first the hearts of the citizens, and then trusting the citizens with public spirit to work out the best results for all.

Distinguish clearly between social reform and socialism. Why cannot people take the same interest in an industry owned and managed by the government as in one owned and managed by themselves? Why are you not as interested in the work of the post office as in your own business?

*Subjects for Further Study.*

- (1) How far did the beliefs of the early Jewish Christians regarding the second coming of Jesus preserve in a new setting the nationalistic hopes of their race?
  - (2) In how far do these beliefs still obscure in many minds the social and spiritual significance of Jesus' mission?
  - (3) Formulate a definition of the rule or democracy of God.
  - (4) Think out carefully the advantages and disadvantages of private property.
  - (5) Look up and report on some socialistic or communistic experiments.)
- 

## CHAPTER XI.

### THE WAY TO HAPPINESS AND SUCCESS.

*Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *The Social Teachings of the Prophets and Jesus*, pp. 220-224.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 356-392.

Follett, *The New State*, pp. 296-330.

Jesus said to his disciples:

"Blessed are the receptive in spirit,  
For they are under the rule of God."

Blessed are the modest,

For they shall inherit the earth.

Blessed are they who mourn,

For they shall be comforted.

Blessed are they who hunger and thirst for righteousness,  
For they shall be satisfied.

Blessed are the merciful,

For they shall receive mercy.

Blessed are the pure in heart,

For they shall see God.

Blessed are the peacemakers,

For they shall be called the children of God.

Blessed are they who are persecuted because of their righteousness,  
For they are under the rule of God.

Blessed are you when you are reviled, persecuted, and falsely maligned  
because of your loyalty to me;

Rejoice and be glad, for great is your reward in heaven, for so the  
prophets who preceded you were persecuted." *Matt. 5: 2-12.* (*Shorter  
Bible translation.*)

## I.

### JESUS' APPRECIATION OF HAPPINESS.

Jesus recognized that the desire for happiness is a dominant motive in the mind of every man and that that desire is natural and right. He himself felt it strongly, and his teachings regarding the way in which true happiness can be attained are based on his own experience as well as on his keen and sympathetic observation. So important did he deem this question that he placed the answer to it at the very beginning of the memorable talk on the hilltop with his disciples in which he laid down his fundamental principles of living (Matt. 5-7). These beatitudes took the place of the stern "Thou-shalt-nots" of the Old Testament law. This fact was a plain declaration that the religion which he proclaimed was indeed "Good News," a religion of joy and not of gloom.

Jesus condensed his teachings regarding happiness into eight brief beatitudes. The beatitude is an especially attractive and effective form of teaching, for it is undogmatic and picturesque. In reality each beatitude is an exclamation: "How divinely happy are the receptive in spirit!" In the presence of a sunset we all exclaim involuntarily, "How beautiful!" So in the beatitude the teacher and the ones taught view life together and formulate their common conclusions.

The Greek word interpreted "blessed" was used by the classic writers to describe only the superlative happiness of the gods. The original Hebrew and Aramaic word represented the

state of perfect happiness that came from going straight and being right: "How normal and happy are the modest!"

Most men in Jesus' day as in our day, too, even after these many years, made the mistake of thinking that happiness can be attained by direct pursuit. Youth too often learns by pitiful experience the principle that Jesus was seeking to teach: real happiness comes only as a result of fulfilling certain simple but definite conditions. The supreme tragedy of human life is that in the hot and direct pursuit of that which promised to give happiness, countless millions throughout the ages have suffered physical, mental, and moral shipwreck. Moreover they fail to distinguish between pleasure and happiness. Jesus sought to prevent all this appalling human wreckage by showing men the better, the only way to win happiness that is real and enduring.

What is the difference between pleasure and happiness? Is pleasure wrong in itself? Why did the Puritans condemn practically all secular pleasures? How far does the happiness of the individual depend upon wealth? Upon the possession of health? What evidence is there that it is part of the eternal purpose revealed in the universe that every individual should be happy?

## II.

### THE MENTAL ATTITUDES ESSENTIAL TO HAPPINESS

The first condition of perfect happiness is a receptive attitude. The poor or receptive in spirit are those who are ready to learn from every experience and every teacher and above all from the divine Teacher. They, therefore, are pre-eminently qualified to co-operate in establishing the rule of God, and to them above all others belong the blessings that it will bring to mankind. In fact, as a result of that attitude they are already enjoying the blessings of that rule. The second condition is modesty or humility. Unfortunately our English words do not fully convey the strength and heroism suggested by this beatitude. To curb one's natural tendency to be self-assertive and to resent real or imagined slights requires the highest strength and courage. He who is able to do so, at once frees himself from those feelings of envy and jealousy and

wounded pride that are the most insidious and malignant foes of his happiness. Ordinarily men feel under obligation to repress the one who is ever urging his own rights and sounding his own praises and to champion the cause of the one whose ability outruns his claims. Notwithstanding appearances, the real honors in the end pass to the modest. As Jesus declared, "The modest inherit the earth." The modest man learns from his own mistakes and from the unenvied excellence of others, and thus acquires power to attain for himself. It is frequently the case that our best business men endeavor to secure the services of lawyers who have beaten them in court or of rivals who have surpassed them in competitive fields. They are glad in their meekness to learn from any one. And their modesty pays dividends. The very wealthy usually have this sane, teachable spirit.

Not the least of the possessions of the modest is the atmosphere of tranquillity and contentment which this modesty creates and which is absolutely essential to happiness.

From the context it is evident that the happiness of those who mourn is not because they mourn for the loss of friends or material possessions but because their ideals for themselves and for society are those of God himself and they lament their own failure and that of others to realize them. The sense of forgiveness, of growth, and of progress alone comforts them. Hence theirs is the feeling of harmony with God and man, the joy of achievement, the consciousness of development, and these are among the most fertile sources of real happiness.

Hunger and thirst are perhaps the most compelling forces in the life of man. We of the western world, however, cannot appreciate the full significance that Jesus' figure in the fourth beatitude had for the men, women, and children living in the parched East and in a thickly populated land where raging thirst and gnawing hunger were a frequent experience of the majority. As in most of Jesus' beatitudes, his opening words, "Happy are those who hunger and thirst," seemed a strange paradox. He took pleasure in thus putting in startling contrast the superficial thoughts of men and those of God as proclaimed by fact and experience. They who hunger and thirst for the right and to be right and that the right may prevail are supremely happy. Theirs is a diviner happiness, when their hunger and thirst are satisfied, than that of the famished man at a bountiful

banquet or that of a thirst-wracked desert wanderer as he at last stoops down to drink from a cool, gushing spring.

An open and receptive mind, a modesty which is forgetful of self and loses itself in the service of others, high ideals and persistency in striving to attain them, and an impelling desire to know what is right and to see that the right always prevails — these are the qualities that the business man demands in him to whom he entrusts important interests. These are the virtues that we desire to find in our friends, and these are the mental attitudes that insure our happiness in this life and through eternity.

What is the value of the paradox in teaching a new and important truth? How does Jesus' life illustrate the strength and heroic quality of humility? Which is the more potent source of unhappiness: the consciousness of being wronged or that of having wronged another? Which of these beatitudes have you found most productive of happiness? Have you tested and found the truth of them all? What ones have you thus tested?

### III.

#### THE ATTITUDE TOWARD SOCIETY ESSENTIAL FOR HAPPINESS.

No teacher in the history of humanity saw more clearly than Jesus the tragic, deadly effects of sin; no one appreciated as did he, the infinite mercy and love of God toward the victims of sin. Slow-footed science is beginning to discover how potent are the forces in nature that combat disease and the influences at work in society to overcome the effects of the folly and weakness of individuals and races. In the presence of modern scientific discovery, we stand in awe before the forces that make for health and sanity and progress. The forces that make for degeneration and destruction are present too, but the theory of evolution is simply a formulation of the conviction, based on the study of millions of data, that the forces working for life and progress in the physical world are ascendant. The same is true in the mental and moral realms. The struggle between these antagonistic forces is the drama of eternity, a drama of realities that make up the history of the universe.

In the last four beatitudes Jesus was trying to make clear

to men the unending happiness that would be theirs if they enlisted all their energies on the side of the eternal forces that make for progress. He taught his disciples to pray, "Forgive us our wrong-doing as we forgive those who wrong us." Mercy is one of the attributes of God. Mercy begets mercy. To a sensitive soul no pain is more intense than that which comes from regret and remorse for wrong done to others. Regret and remorse are the flames of the real hell in which every sinner finds himself sooner or later. They are the deadly foes of all happiness. Every religion has been compelled by the crying needs of suffering humanity to offer some way of escape. Judaism suggested the insufficient palliatives of almsgiving and sacrifice and ceremonial. Jesus quietly waived these aside and proposed a more fundamental, in fact the only cure: like God, be merciful to all men, and then the happiness you crave will be yours, for you will learn the power of love to forgive. You will be merciful to your penitent self as you are to others. Your fellow men will gladly grant to you the mercy and forgiveness that you give to them, and at last you will understand how completely your own sins and failures are forgiven by the eternal heart of love. Then you will experience the deep abiding happiness that comes to a soul freed from all harshness and hatred and filled with a sense of harmony with all men and with the infinite Will that is working for perfection.

The sixth beatitude is too axiomatic to require interpretation: "Supremely normal and happy are the pure in heart, for they shall see God." The Aramaic word means both mind and heart. The scientist who studies nature with unbiased mind sees clearly certain of the infinite manifestations of God. The open-minded inventor discovers certain principles hitherto hidden and makes them useful for the service of mankind. The joy of discovery is certainly one of the purest sources of happiness known to men.

In the light of its Old Testament message, the phrase "pure in heart" described especially that freedom from prejudice and from the shadow of sin and of those impure or superficial thoughts or unbridled feelings that darken the vision, confuse the judgment and make the great majority of men wholly or partially blind to the manifestations of God and of his good purpose. These good purposes are evident at every turn to the men who have eyes to see, and give them while here

on earth a foretaste of the happiness which is in store for us throughout eternity.

Why does the merciful attitude necessitate more accurate analysis of motives but no more leniency in the treatment of a defiant criminal? Cite typical cases from the life of Jesus and from modern life. Why are children usually inclined to condemn in others sins or faults which they overlook or excuse in themselves? In how far is the Christian Science teaching that the sins of the individual do not represent the real self correct? Is social immorality increasing or decreasing in our Anglo-Saxon nations? Cf. *e.g.*, reports of draft boards. What measures can and should the church take to combat this evil?

#### IV.

##### THE JOY OF CO-OPERATING WITH GOD.

Into the seventh and eighth beatitudes Jesus put the essence of his life experience. Whatever be his origin, his supreme title to be called the Son of God lies in the fact that, like his divine Father, he was a creator of harmony and completeness. The meaning of these pregnant Aramaic words has already been discussed (p. 26). From childhood to old age one of the chief sources of happiness is creation. The author, the artist, the architect, the manual laborer, the devoted parent, the statesman, and all who rise above the mere struggle for food and possessions find their great joy in constructive work. "Constructive workmanship" is one of the most significant watchwords of the present day. To make man's happiness complete it is important (1) that the work be well done, (2) that it win recognition because it supplies a real need, and (3) that it permanently enrich the life of humanity. The work that Jesus sets before his followers in the highest measure meets these exacting requirements. He invites them to join with God in building well that which is not temporal but eternal: developed manhood and womanhood, the perfect home and community and society, and above all thus to secure for themselves and for their fellows that complete happiness which alone will make perfect the joy of God himself.

Were we not living in an heroic age, Jesus' eighth beatitude would seem too paradoxical to be true: "Supremely blest are

those who are persecuted because they are doing right, for they already share the joys of God's rule!" Lest it should not be fully understood he expands it: "Suffering for a cause like that which I present allies you with the heroic order of the prophets and insures to you unending happiness." The records of the beloved community that rallied about Jesus and his cause illustrate the joy that came to ordinary men and women even in the midst of persecution and in part even because of persecution. The joy of sacrifice for a noble cause and for conscience' sake was theirs. And there can be no truer joy. The history of his followers during the strenuous opening Christian centuries is also replete with dramatic illustrations. The blood-stained battle fields of France illustrated the unspeakable happiness that comes through the sacrifice of comfort and possessions, and life if need be, for a great cause. "It was all one great and glorious picnic," one college boy of twenty wrote to his mother when the armistice was signed and he looked back on three months spent in leading his company, almost without cessation, against shock and shell, in the face of machine gun fire and the more deadly peril of poisoned gas. Perhaps the greatest tragedy in human life is never to have felt and responded to the call to suffer in behalf of a great cause. Jesus worked and taught and gave his life that he might deliver men from this tragedy and give them this exquisite happiness of life. "Supremely happy are you when you are reviled, persecuted, and falsely maligned because of your loyalty to me" was said first to his early followers and they knew it was true; but it contains an eternal principle which our old, easy-going world was fast forgetting before it was aroused by the strenuous demands of the new age. If the ideals for which our finest youth have so generously given their lives are to be preserved, even greater and more universal loyalty and sacrifice are now demanded.

In his quiet way Jesus established new standards of value, although he was ready to test them all in the scales of individual happiness. Instead of wealth and possessions, personal honors, prestige and power, he set as goals for which to strive, open-mindedness, modesty, a yearning for absolute truth, justice, uprightness, the merciful spirit, purity of heart, creative power, and a worthy cause for which to strive and sacrifice. "Strive for these," he declared, "and you will attain them and as a glorious by-product you will also win happiness that is both

satisfying and abiding." The proof of the truth of these teachings is found in the laboratory of life.

What types of business would you call creative in the sense of the seventh beatitude and what are not? In choosing an occupation how far should one seek that which is creative? What are some of the modern causes for which men can win happiness through persecution?

## V.

### COMMUNITY HAPPINESS AND SUCCESS.

In any community organized on the plans laid down by Jesus we should find the citizens in close personal touch one with the other, each attempting to render what constructive service he can in order to promote the public welfare. Blessed is the community that has a receptive spirit and is eager to avail itself of the practical experience wrought out in other communities. The results may be gained through agents sent to study the work being done in other progressive communities or through specialists.

The normal organization for the promotion of any public enterprise is first by voluntary groups who meet to plan and discuss, then under the influence of a group or of several groups, the community either in a voluntary public meeting or in its official public capacity takes up its specific problems and works them out in the light of knowledge won through careful study and investigation.

Following the example of the great community organizer, one's thought naturally turns first in any community to the saving of lives and the promotion of the physical welfare. The citizens organize to secure good sanitation, a pure water supply, a safe system of drainage, and whatever improvements are necessary to prevent infections of any kind that promote disease. Hospitals are built in accord with the plans that insure the best care for the physically and mentally ill.

Next, careful attention is given to living and working conditions. The whole community is interested in seeing that proper arrangements are made for housing all classes in such a way that comfort, good morals, and enjoyment are provided for each and every individual.

In any democratic country, such as the United States, and even more in the coming democracy of God, care should be taken that the common citizen be trained in such a way that not only is his own welfare promoted but also the safety and welfare of the entire community. This means, of course, school systems of the best type. Perhaps on no other public enterprise at the present time, even in the United States where public education is so much discussed, is there manifested so great a spirit of unwillingness to spend money as on schools in order to secure the best teaching. While it is true that a very large proportion of our municipal and state budgets are devoted to education, every thoughtful student of the subject knows that far too small a proportion of that budget is devoted to the pay of teachers. Certainly if the principle of Jesus is true that minds and hearts are developed and changed by personal influence and patient instruction, there could be no greater mistake. Buildings are of slight account compared with the personal influence of the teacher, and yet in many instances the community is willing to pay those into whose charge the children of the community are placed for their mental and moral training, far less than it pays the men who build our houses and make our roads and railroads. It is not strange, therefore, that these communities fail to obtain the happiness which comes only when citizens are trained to be open-minded, eager to know and do what is right, pure in mind and heart and prepared to do constructive work.

Education should include, of course, not merely the ordinary accomplishments of the arts of reading, writing, and arithmetic, but should include also the development of the artistic spirit through the establishment of art galleries, the proper training in nature study, the building of parks, the direction of the architecture of our cities and especially the training in morals in the broadest and best sense of that word. How far this can make happiness and success, and whether it should be promoted by governmental means or by the voluntary association of the citizens, are immaterial. The methods by which these ends should be secured naturally vary in different communities. In some places the government will take the lead, in others voluntary organization. The one thing that is essential is that the individual members of the community through joint counsel and common action secure the results, and that

not the few but the many experience the happiness of doing this vital constructive work.

Is there danger of weakening the morale of a community by giving free of charge to the citizens education, art, entertainment?

What effect would free rides on street railways supported by taxation have on the welfare of the community? May a community have happiness in large degree without welfare, or welfare without happiness? In what ways can each member of a community be enabled and influenced to make his special contribution to the well-being and happiness of the whole?

## VI.

### NATIONAL HAPPINESS AND SUCCESS.

The same principles that apply in smaller communities apply in the wider field of the nation's activities. The methods, however, must vary. In a small community, through town meetings or the voluntary action of groups of individuals, common action may be secured. In the broader field of the nation the work must be done through representatives. These representatives should be chosen with especial reference to the attainment of the ends desired.

The field of activity of the nation is also different from that of the local community. There must be, first, the protection of the people as a whole against foreign aggression. The direction of army and navy services are necessary, and the control and management of diplomatic relations with other countries must be in the hands of the national government.

In order that the health of the citizens may be protected, the national government must establish rules and institutions for enforcing quarantine regulations against the importing of contagious diseases. Similar regulations will prevent the importation of diseases that affect animals and plants. Often it becomes necessary, in order to be certain of a proper food supply and to assure the development of essential industries, that regulations regarding the imports and exports of goods of various kinds be made and administered. Likewise for the protection of morals and for the building up of a citizenship of

the highest type, the representatives of the nation must provide for the regulation of immigration and must through such regulations prevent the bringing in of people whose teachings and influence would be detrimental.

More certain than preventive measures of protection against other nations, necessary as these are at times, are the positive constructive policies that should be established to promote in all communities a more intimate knowledge of foreign peoples and governments and the cultivation of international good will. This is a task worthy of the best efforts of highly trained diplomats and broad-minded citizens.

It is not possible, especially in the present stage of human knowledge and with the present relations existing among nations, that the best results be attained, but excellent beginnings have been made in certain fields. Already in several countries we find affiliated associations for labor legislation. There are international university societies which seek to bring together socially the scholars of different countries when they are visiting foreign lands. The Pan-American Society promotes in all social and educational ways the union of the nations of the American continent. The Pan-American Union and the Pan-American Financial Conferences in similar manner seek to secure joint action on political and financial questions. The exchange professorships and the numerous visiting committees among nations all lead strongly in the same direction. Even more promising in many ways are the activities of our great mission boards, of the Young Men's and Young Women's Christian Associations, and other religious bodies in this international field. The Interchurch World Movement is already enlisted in this service and the outlook for the future brightens. As yet, we must confess, only a promising beginning has been made. With the right motives, however, on the part of the citizens, with the proper desire to promote the public welfare not merely at home but also abroad, much can be done to improve present conditions. The way to happiness for human society as well as for the individual lies along the plain paths marked out by Jesus. Receptivity, aspiration, modesty, zeal to know and do what is right, consideration for others, freedom from prejudice and immorality, constructive workmanship and readiness to suffer for a righteous cause are international as well as individual virtues.

What can be done in our public schools to cultivate friendly interest in foreign peoples? What is the effect of foreign missions on international politics? What dangers should be recognized and avoided in foreign mission work? What can be done to develop a Christian sympathy and plans for united work that will promote the permanent happiness of the human race?

*Subjects for Further Study.*

(1) How would you define happiness, and is it a worthy goal for which to strive? Distinguish clearly the meanings of happiness, joy, enjoyment, pleasure, fun, contentment. (*Hilts, Happiness.*)

(2) What would have been the effect on Jesus' personal happiness if he had yielded to the impulses revealed in the story of his temptation? In what sense was his life on earth supremely happy, and what were the chief sources of his happiness?

(3) In what ways does modern science, and especially the results of sociology, criminology, and psycho-analysis, tend to promote the merciful attitude toward wrong-doers?

(4) Why do sins of social immorality so completely blunt the religious and moral sense of those who commit them?

(5) What sources of happiness does Dr. Richard Cabot suggest in his volume, *What Men Live For*? What sources would you add?

(6) Analyze the influences which (1) tend to destroy your individual happiness, and (2) tend to promote your happiness. Make a similar analysis of the community in which you live. Make a similar analysis of the present international situation.

(7) How far are mere misunderstandings sources of trouble and unhappiness among individuals, communities, and nations?

## CHAPTER XII.

### THE UNIVERSALITY OF JESUS' PRINCIPLES OF LIFE.

#### *Parallel Readings.*

Kent, *Historical Bible*, V, pp. 310-322.

Cooley, *Social Organization*, pp. 395-419.

Follett, *The New State*, pp. 333-373.

I am the way, the truth, and the life; no man comes to the Father except through me. If you have learned to know me, you would have known my Father also; from now on you know him and have seen him.

He who has seen me has seen the Father; then how can you say, "Let us see the Father"? Do you not believe that I am in the Father and the Father in me? The words that I speak to you I speak not on my own

authority, but the Father who is always in me does his own work. Believe me, I am in the Father and the Father in me, or else believe me because of the work itself. I say to you, he who believes in me will do the work which I do and still greater works than these, for I go to my Father. And whatever you shall ask in my name I will do, that the Father may be glorified through the Son. If you ask anything in my name I will do it.

If you love me you will keep my commands, and I shall ask the Father and he will give you another Helper to be with you forever, even the Spirit of truth. The world cannot receive that Spirit, because it does not see him nor know him; you know him, for he remains with you and shall be within you.

I will not leave you bereaved; I am coming to you. In a little while the world will see me no more; but you shall see me, because I live and you shall live also. At that day you will understand that I am in my Father and you in me and I in you. He who has my commands and obeys them is the one who loves me; and he who loves me will be loved by my Father, and I will love him and will reveal myself to him.

He who does not love me does not obey my teachings. The message which you hear is not mine but that of the Father who sent me.

I have told you all this while I am still with you; but the Helper, the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, will teach you everything and remind you of all that I have said to you.

Peace I leave with you, my own peace I give to you; not as the world gives do I give to you. Let not your heart be troubled nor afraid. You have heard me tell you that I go away and am coming back to you? If you love me you will rejoice because I am going to the Father, for the Father is greater than I. I have told you this now before it occurs, that when it does occur you may believe. *John 14: 6, 7, 9b — 21, 24-29.*

I have said all this to you that you may have peace through union with me. In the world you have affliction; but be courageous. I have conquered the world. *John 16: 33.*

Judge not that you may not be judged, for as you judge others you will yourself be judged, and according to the measure with which you deal out to others, it will be dealt out to you. *Matt. 7: 1, 2.* (*Shorter Bible translation.*)

## I.

### JESUS, THE REAL DISCOVERER OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

It is a fact not generally recognized that Jesus was the first of the great social thinkers and creative builders of society to lay the foundations for the true democratic social state. We do not think of Jesus ordinarily as a philosopher; we think of him rather as a man of action, basing his acts upon a few simple articles of faith. A careful analysis of his works, however, will show that his acts were determined by a profound philosophy based upon an intimate knowledge of human nature.

We have seen (Chapter V) that Jesus laid especial emphasis

in his teaching upon individual responsibility and the development to the utmost of personality. The ancient fathers had no such understanding of the significance and value of the individual, although Socrates apparently had some glimmering of the idea. In the ideal Republic of Plato, and even in the critical teachings of the more practical Aristotle, there was indeed a well-worked-out plan for a democratic government; but the great mass of the common people, even in the ideal commonwealths, were always to remain laborers, mere hewers of wood and drawers of water, whose energies were to be expended primarily in doing the manual and routine work necessary to furnish leisure to the thinkers, the philosophers, who were to be the actual rulers and to make the plans for the work of society. In the Athenian commonwealth probably ninety per cent of the inhabitants were practically slaves. The ten per cent who were educated by the State and who spent their time in discussing public affairs and philosophy, perhaps to a greater extent than any other people of history, had among themselves doubtless a keen appreciation of the worth of the individual citizen but not of the individual human being.

Even in the days of the ancient Hebrew commonwealth, democratic as it was in conception, there still remained always the belief that certain classes, especially the priests, were those who were to interpret to the people the will of God and thereby to furnish them chiefly their rules of action in life. The ordinary individuals did right in the view of the great teachers if they followed unthinkingly the precepts laid down for them by the priestly rulers.

In consequence, the belief and teaching of Jesus that the ordinary individual was of infinite worth in the sight of God was to the Jewish teachers a revolutionary idea subversive of not only the political order of the day but also of the existing religious order.

To-day we are in a position both socially and psychologically to recognize the truth and practicability of Jesus' principle. Many as are the mistakes that are made by even the best of the modern democracies, and discouraging as is often the slowness of the progress of popular rule, it seems to be a fairly well established fact that it is only through the development of the great masses of the common people until they can recognize the real social value of their acts, that there can be permanent

safety in any form of government. "The cure for the evils of democracy is more democracy." That means, it is becoming evident to the world that we must rely upon popular self-government, and the only way to keep that form of government from falling into either anarchy or despotism is through the intellectual and moral training of the individual. Practically all political and social thinkers of the present day believe that with such training democracy will be successful; without it, there will be many failures and much delay in the attainment of the best, but nothing else than democracy is practicable or possible. Jesus is primarily responsible for this belief of modern times.

In what respects is the obedience to law of a strong personality more commendable than the obedience of a weak man?

How far do individuals exist for the sake of society? How far does society exist for the sake of its individual members?

## II.

### THE WORLD'S GREATEST SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGIST.

The principle of human worth is also psychologically sound both in political and in religious life. Unless the individual voter can be made to feel that he personally is of some worth and of true value to society, he will not be willing to take the time and energy required to fit himself for the duties of citizenship. If on the other hand he feels that he can accomplish things worth while, he will be the more ready to assume responsibility.

This principle is likewise the true explanation in the field of religion of the so-called miraculous conversions, when they are real conversions, of the Salvation Army and of the old-time revivalists. Usually it will be noted that the persons having this experience, and the ones who are most frequently cited as wonderful examples of God's redeeming power, are those who have been most degraded. Often they are men or women of education who have come from the cultivated classes of society, but who under the influence of strong drink or evil passions or weak wills have fallen into depths of degradation. After a debauch, coming from the gutter into a mission, almost hopeless from degrading experiences that are the result of his own weakness, the sinner feels his utter worthlessness. Frequently he

has contemplated suicide as the only way out of the depths. Then he hears the message of the revivalist telling of the infinite love of God and assuring him that God's personal love for him has been so great that he has sent his only begotten Son as a sacrifice for his redemption. Caught by the suggestion of his own worth through God's love, he acquires courage and confidence that with God's help he may recover his former mental and moral status and may even go on to the performance of duties that will be beneficial to others. The suggestion continually renewed gives him power and the man stands actually redeemed from his own weakness, as long as the power of the wholesome suggestion remains.

Naturally such an explanation of the marvellous experience in no way derogates from the power of the Spirit of God in working out this redemption. The fact is that the conversion and the resulting redemption are strictly in accord with the ordinary well-understood laws of psychology, and that in consequence we may understand better how such signal acts of redemption may be made more frequent and more permanent.

To have seen clearly this possibility and to have acted, as did Jesus, first of all the great teachers, shows his marvellous insight into human nature and his supreme position as a social philosopher. In the light of the historical effects of his life and teachings, which prove experimentally the accuracy of his insight into the workings of the human mind and heart, it is not too much to assert that he is the greatest social psychologist of history.

Why has Jesus not been counted among the great philosophers and psychologists by historical writers? What ground is there for classifying religious leaders like Confucius, Buddha, and Mohammed, as philosophers and psychologists?

### III.

#### THE SUPREME INTERPRETER OF GOD.

Many have been the controversies over the doctrine of the divinity of Jesus. Apparently of late years the issue is drawn between those who speak of Jesus' miraculous birth in a physical sense and those who look upon Jesus primarily as the spiritual

interpreter of God to men. Although from ancient times philosophers have speculated regarding the essential nature of all things and have wondered regarding ultimate realities, since the days of Immanuel Kant, practically all thinking people have recognized that men are conscious of phenomena — things as they appear to human minds — and that they do not know and are incapable of finding out just what is the ultimate reality that produces the effects upon our senses which make us conscious of these phenomena. No one knows, or presumably ever can know, just what is the nature of life, of light, of electricity, of gravitation, or of all the multiplicity of material things that we see and touch and taste. We are conscious of their appearances to us. Beyond that we know absolutely nothing.

In the same way we grasp the idea of God. In different countries, in different stages of civilization, the conception of God of necessity varies as people interpret the causes of natural phenomena in different ways. Among primitive peoples the beneficent and the destructive effects of natural phenomena such as sunshine, wind, cold and heat, normally give rise, when people seek for causes, to beliefs in some unknown beneficent and maleficent beings that are called gods. Primitive peoples, naturally judging these forces by their results, ascribe to them human qualities: good-will, love, hatred, envy; and they naturally in consequence attempt to please the unknown forces or gods to whom they are grateful and to propitiate those whom they fear.

No two nations or peoples have ever had identically the same conception of the gods or of the one supreme God. It is not too much to say that inasmuch as no two individuals can ever be quite identical in thought or feeling, so no two individuals can ever have quite the same conception of God. It often seems that the great pathetic tragedy of life is that no one can ever absolutely know the mind and heart of another; hence arise misunderstandings and distrust, even at times among those best loved. If we recognize fully the undeniable fact that there must necessarily be great differences of opinion regarding God, his nature, and our attitude and duties toward him, we shall see how necessary it is that great religious teachers should arise at all stages of the world's history to shape the views of humanity on these vital questions.

All Christian people of all denominations have accepted as their own, Jesus' teachings regarding the nature of God. God is to them a loving, beneficent intelligence, who looks upon men as a father looks upon his children. This conception of God comes to us from Jesus. While the ancient Jewish prophets in many respects had a similar view, none of them developed the conception as thoroughly as did Jesus. He has thus become to all Christians, and to humanity at large as rapidly as they come into sympathetic touch with his views, the supreme interpreter of God to man. We know God primarily, almost solely, through him. In him lived the spirit of God. Only through the life of a human being on earth could we learn the spirit of God in such a way that it could exert its full influence upon us. He thus becomes to us all our God in man and in him we see and learn God's nature and God's will. It is literally and psychologically true that when we have seen him we have seen the Father. We might take an additional step and say that it is only through him that men have seen the Father in the sense in which Jesus himself saw him. Men in other times and in all stages of civilization have thought that they have seen God, but they have not seen God as Jesus saw him. And, as Paul said, it is this unknown God that Jesus has interpreted to men.

In shaping the conduct of men, which would have the more beneficent influence, a belief in the miraculous birth of Jesus or a belief in his oneness of spirit with God? In what sense may we properly speak of Socrates, Confucius, or Mohammed as interpreters of God to men, or as divine in their natures? Are their relations to the religious beliefs of their followers different in kind or in degree from those of Jesus to his followers? Shall we say that they are not interpreters of God to men, or that they are false interpreters, or that they are less accurate and less worthy interpreters than Jesus? What are the grounds of your judgment?

#### IV.

##### THE COMPLETE HARMONIZER OF MAN WITH GOD.

If we believe that Jesus possessed to the full the normal attributes of humanity and that he likewise so possessed the attributes of God that he could truly say, "I am in the Father and the Father in me; when you have seen me, you have seen

the Father," is it not clear that we all, with our human frailties, may likewise have in some degree a share in the divine attributes? In our English language the word *God* is derived from the same Anglo-Saxon source as the word *good*. In consequence, we normally think of goodness as the chief attribute of God, though we also normally think of supreme knowledge and power as his attributes. From observation of nature and from philosophical speculation in all stages of the world's history, men have looked upon their Divinity as possessing to some extent at least the attributes of power and of knowledge. In many cases they have felt that the power was limited by some other even greater power, such as Fate, and that the knowledge was so limited that even human beings might deceive the gods. It is from the Jews, primarily, that Christians have derived the conception of the one God, maker of heaven and earth, creator of nature's unchanging laws, and in consequence, the all-knowing as well as all-powerful God. The earlier prophets did not represent Jehovah as supreme in goodness toward the enemies of his chosen people or at times to the Hebrews themselves. He might be cruel and revengeful. Though some of the later prophets emphasized strongly the beneficence and goodness of God, it has been primarily through the life and teachings of Jesus that men have learned to know and worship God as the supreme source of goodness, never cruel, never vindictive, never imposing punishments upon his human children, only permitting them to suffer the natural consequences of a violation of his unchanging laws. Endowed as human beings are with intelligence, he has made them competent to search into these laws and to understand something of their nature. As in the physical realm it is possible for men, as they slowly learn the workings of nature's laws, so to adapt themselves as to be benefited by them, so likewise in the realm of mind and soul we may place ourselves in harmony with the divine laws and thus become better and happier men and women. In this realm of the mind and spirit Jesus has been our great teacher — one may almost say our only teacher — in bringing about this harmony between the will of men and the will of God. If we study the life of Jesus, with an understanding of the relation of his life to God's will, we may through the influence of his spirit so put ourselves into harmony with God's laws and God's spirit as interpreted by Jesus, that we shall be regen-

erated and gradually acquire more and more of the divine attributes. The life of Jesus has made this seem possible. His teachings and his life have shown the way. "I am the way, the truth, and the life."

Does a thief best overcome his propensity to steal through avoiding opportunities to steal, or strongly willing that he will not steal when an opportunity offers, or through fixing his attention upon the moral and social law which shows the evil consequences of a dishonest life and the good consequences of an honest life?

When a man tries to harmonize his actions with the moral law as well as with the physical laws of nature is this harmonizing act a matter of will, or of knowledge, or of both? How far is it possible to avoid the suffering arising from a violation of nature's laws by fixing one's attention upon the moral and spiritual nature of man and ignoring physical law? How do you justify the sufferings of humanity through man's ignorance of nature's laws; for example, the sufferings from small-pox and cholera and yellow fever, before men understood the nature of these diseases?

## V.

### THE FOUNDER OF COMPLETE DEMOCRACY.

A majority of the great teachers who preceded Jesus had chiefly in mind the great value to mankind of having certain select individuals of strong intellect and character as the leaders of men, while the great masses were to be followers. Jesus, by recognizing the worth of the common man and the consequent necessity of training him and of placing the responsibility upon him, was the first to proclaim and to institute complete democracy. This same principle of democracy applies also in the field of religion and of business. Democracy is not only a form of government or political organization; it is far more than that: it is a means of social growth. It apparently provides the only guarantee of stability in all of the different fields of human activity. Jesus became the founder of essential democracy because he best of all understood human nature and saw that even the poorest man, the man whose intellect is common-

place, if he can be inspired with the proper spirit and with a sense of duty toward God and of service to his fellow men, becomes a real factor in society. In doing his duty he becomes content to do his work; and he is freed from the spirit of revolt so long as he is in a position to render his best service.

It has not been so fully recognized in the past as it is certain to be in the future that this spirit of democracy is applicable also in business. In any business organization there are various tasks to be performed. Each man must do his work in his own department to the best advantage, if the co-ordinate work of all is to secure the best results. In the management of a railroad we need not merely a board of directors, a chief engineer, locomotive engineers and firemen, but also conductors, shop men and section hands. The work must be co-ordinated by the comparatively few men at the head of the organization, but if the work is to be successful, each man within his own field must do his work well. No man will do his work to the best advantage unless he feels his responsibility. He cannot be trained to the best advantage unless he is given the opportunity of thinking out for himself the ways in which he can best do his own work. Even a section hand has a choice as to where and how he will use his shovel, pick and sledge. If he feels that the choice is given him and if he can be rewarded in proportion to the results obtained, he will accomplish more and he will have a more willing spirit than if he works absolutely under orders. This placing of responsibility upon each workman in his own field of activity is not only in accordance with the essential spirit of democracy which Jesus taught, but it is also the most practical way of securing the best business results. Even when working with automatic machines much depends upon the care, the attention, and the faithfulness of the workman. Often without further direction a change in the spirit of workmen has increased the output of an establishment twenty-five per cent or fifty per cent or even more.

If taught to share responsibility and therefore to think about their work, laborers will secure a business education attainable in no other way. The continual habit of thinking about their work also develops them intellectually and improves their skill, making them in consequence far more productive. Again, with the consciousness of their own growth and with the increased income that comes with their improvement in pro-

ductive capacity, there normally comes a feeling of contentment with their position.

We shall, therefore, in the future, when the importance of industrial democracy is fully recognized, hear much less of unrest among working men. There will be fewer strikes; there will be much greater stability in business and a vast increase in production. The form of business organization, like the form of political organization, is not so essential as is the proper spirit on the part of the individuals concerned. The final and lasting solution of labor difficulties and the attainment of real industrial democracy will come only through a readjustment that will develop the right spirit of individuals.

Normally, of course, with the increase in output that comes from the improved spirit in workmen will go an increase in their share of the product. Such an increase may come through what is often called profit sharing, but which ought to be really a share in the value of the increase of the total product brought about in part by their own better work.

The new spirit, too, will lead naturally, as experience in many cases has already shown, to a sharing with the workmen of the responsibilities of management in those fields in which they are concerned and fitted to direct, such as matters of working conditions, safety, sanitation, hours of labor, wages. With the right spirit on the part of employers and workmen, such changes will readily come. Without such a spirit, these methods will not succeed. The right spirit is the essential condition and factor in success.

Why is slave labor industrially unprofitable? Are intelligence and a habit of thinking on the part of wage-earners subversive or promotive of discipline and co-operation and efficiency? Does thinking among workmen hinder or favor team work?

## VI.

### THE ETERNAL COSMOPOLITAN.

Emphasis should be placed upon the universality of these principles of Jesus which are the result of his penetrating, thorough insight into human nature. There has been criticism,

and just criticism, of cosmopolitanism as compared with patriotism. No man is able to work most helpfully for the world unless he demonstrates first his ability to work well for his own people and his own nation. It is primarily through his own nation that he can affect the welfare of other nations. He who serves best his own country will serve best the world. He can serve best the world if his principles of living are laid so deep in human nature that they satisfy all men in all countries.

Human nature is much the same everywhere; nevertheless we must recognize to the full the varied traits and customs of different peoples and races. In some, owing to customs and training, certain motives are relatively strong and others relatively weak; but fundamentally all men are so alike that they recognize the basic principles that Jesus taught.

There are no races of men who do not appreciate the doctrine that the individual man, however poor, is of untold value in the sight of God. There are no races of men who do not realize that truth and fair dealing are beneficial in the end, although there are great differences among nations as regards their trustworthiness in business affairs; some lay far greater emphasis upon courtesy and good manners than upon strict truthfulness in speech.

It is universally true that, as individuals have placed upon them in the measure of their capacity to bear it, the responsibility for their own work, this responsibility becomes a means of training them and a method by which they are developed into stronger and better human beings. There are no peoples who do not in the long run appreciate the spirit of unselfishness, although there are few people of any race who practice the spirit of unselfishness to so great a degree as would be desirable.

The rapid growth of the Christian religion throughout the world among all peoples and races proves beyond question the universal soundness of its principles. That Jesus' basic principles of living, as presented to the non-Christian world, have in many cases been overlooked or obscured by denominational differences must be frankly admitted. When these principles are presented in their simplicity and when due emphasis is laid upon Jesus' teachings as a basis for living and for the organization of human society, it is certain that his religion will extend far more rapidly.

The universality of Jesus' principles points not only to the brotherhood of men in all their different fields of activity in a community, but to the brotherhood of men of all countries. Furthermore, the application of these principles means the training of nobler men. As men come to recognize more and more the benefit of intimate relations one with another, and as they gradually grow into nobler men, we shall find the democracy of God extending from individual churches and local communities to widely separated nations, until eventually there will be ushered in the democracy of God throughout the world, a democracy not merely of men such as now exist, but ultimately a world democracy of more Godlike men.

To what extent should children be made to bear responsibility? Why is the power of choice essential to the development of strong character? May a strong character be bad?

Is perpetual world peace more likely to come through a league of strong independent nations or through a powerful world state dominating weak nations? What other alternative can you suggest?

*Subjects for Further Study.*

- (1) Compare Jesus' view of man's ability to determine his own spiritual fate with that of William James.
- (2) How would you fix the proper limits of community ownership and management of wealth? In reaching your decision compare the views of the Socialist, Morris Hillquit, and Professor Taussig.
- (3) How far will the nature of the business organization of any society affect its political organization, and vice versa?
- (4) What would be the effect on international relations if all people were unselfish?
- (5) In what measure is selfishness the cause of strife both between individuals and nations?









## FOURTEEN DAYS

A fine of TWO CENTS will be charged for each day the book is kept over time.

230



3 4320 00113 5096

JESUS' PRINCIPLES OF  
LIVING

by Kent and Jenks

3679 Jesus' Principles of

232.95 Living

K413J Kent, Charles F.

MY 9	70	6		
DE 10		1014		

THE CINCINNATI BIBLE  
SEMINARY LIBRARY

232.95 K413j

Ac. #3679

Kent, Charles Foster.

Jesus' principles of living

